1986

Normative teacher and student role behaviors in the U.S. with a contrast to Japan

Kathleen Ulrich
Portland State University

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Kathleen Ulrich for the Master of Arts in Speech Communication presented June 12, 1986.

Title: Normative Teacher and Student Role Behaviors in the U.S. With a Contrast to Japan

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[redacted]

LaRay M. Barna, Chairman

[redacted]

Theodore G. Grove

[redacted]

Milton Bennett

[redacted]

Jeanette DeCarrico

The purpose of this thesis is to (1) discover normative U.S. classroom teacher and student role behaviors; (2) contrast these to one other culture, Japan and (3) anticipate the difficulties both teachers and students would face if placed in a culturally mixed class unaware of the cultural differences between them. This study also (4) extends the issues theoretically beyond the cultural differences between the U.S. and Japan to other cultures.

In addition to the literature review, data was gathered by means of a questionnaire and observation checklists. Both the questionnaire and observation checklist were matched with ones used in the Barna (1986) study which was conducted in Japan. U.S. high school and college students completed the questionnaire and several high school classes were observed. A reliability test was done on the questionnaire and those items that proved reliable were statistically analyzed. Items that were reliable in both the U.S. and Japanese study were then contrasted.

Differences were found in classroom role behaviors between the U.S. and Japan. Primarily, the U.S. classroom role behaviors reflect the U.S. values of individualism, equality, and informality. In general, teachers and students have an open communicative relationshp and students are encouraged to give their opinion and interact in classroom discussions. The Japanese classroom role behaviors, on the other hand, reflect the Japanese values of groupism, hiearchial relationships, and formality. The relationship between the teacher and student is far more formal and ritualized than in the U.S.. Students are not expected to interact in the classroom, but rather to remain quiet and speak only when called upon. The results proved interesting and heightened one's awareness that classroom role behaviors stem from basic cultural values.

NORMATIVE TEACHER AND STUDENT ROLE BEHAVIORS IN THE U.S. WITH A CONTRAST TO JAPAN

by

KATHLEEN ULRICH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University

1986

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Kathleen Ulrich presented June 12, 1986.

[redacted]

LaRay M. Barna, Chairman

[redacted]

Theodore G. Grove

[redacted]

Milton Bennett

[redacted]

Jeanette DeCarrico

APPROVED:

[redacted]

Theodore G. Grove, Head, Department of Speech Communication

[redacted]

Bernard Ross, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis could not have been done without the many individuals — friends, family and colleagues — who offered their support, encouragement, expertise, and caring. A heartfelt thanks to Mrs. Barna who inspired me to do this research project and whose "endless" editing, suggestions, and encouragement benefited me greatly and enabled me to get through this with a real feeling of accomplishment. Dr. Grove deserves a special thanks for the many hours of help with the computer. To the other members of my committee, Dr. Bennett and Dr. DeCarrico, thank you for your comments which helped shape the final form of this project. I am indebted to Kazuko and Emiko for their careful translating, to Mary whose encouragement was always a phone call away, to my mother who spent hours proof reading, and to my father who always said I could do it. My many experiences teaching English as a Second Language have made me aware of how important and necessary a study as this one is.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It was Deborah Johnson's first teaching experience after her graduation from a Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) program. Feeling prepared, self assured, yet somewhat anxious, she approached her classroom with confidence and a smile. As she entered, the entire group of Japanese high school girls stood up and in unison said, "Good morning teacher." Deborah blushed returning the greeting and encouraged the class to sit down--to relax. "This is going to be fun!" she thought. Yet, no one smiled...blank faces. "What's wrong with these girls?" she wondered. "Maybe it's jet lag." When she asked, "How are you?" to some of the students, she was given a flat "Fine thank you and you." from everyone she asked.

Discouraged with the formal seating arrangement, she asked the students to help her put the desks in a circle--again blank faces. Before she knew it, the girls were holding a conference. Finally emerging from the group came one girl who acted as a spokesperson for the rest. She wanted to know exactly how the desks were supposed to be placed. Feeling awkward, Deborah tried to explain. The girl returned to the group and delegated the work. In no time the desks were placed in a perfect circle. Deborah's attempt to make the class more informal was a failure, the circle seemed as formal as the straight rows. When the students sat down they retained the same blank faces, but with an occasional whisper and giggle.

Deborah started to feel rather self conscious. She found that every time she asked a question, it had to be addressed to a specific student, a general question to the class yielded no response. After a posed question, several would confer and the answer always emerged resembling a line from a grammar book. Often when called on, the students giggled, holding their hands against their mouths--how silly Deborah thought. Feeling frustrated, she decided to drop her attempt at conversation and try a pronunciation exercise. When she asked the class to repeat after her, everyone repeated in the same tone of voice, speed and loudness-- it was like a chorus.

Deborah never felt comfortable with her class throughout the four week term. It was hard to understand why. Her students never seemed to relax; they would never volunteer information in a discussion. She feared she was boring them and they weren't learning. She had thought she was prepared to teach English --after all, she had been trained at one of the best schools, but whatever technique she tried, nothing worked; she felt a failure. She began to wonder if teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) could be rewarding.

What went wrong in Deborah's class? Why didn't the students respond the way she expected? Did she really fail? Did she perhaps expect something they were unfamiliar with? How did the students feel? This study will explore the questions of whether different behaviors are expected of teachers and students in the classroom from one culture to another.

Justification

In today's society, both teachers and students have countless

opportunities to travel, teach and study in other countries. Even within the U.S., one doesn't even have to go far to find someone else from a different culture. It is even common to find a variety of cultures in the same classroom.

The Institute of International Education (IIE) estimates that there were 342,113 foreign students enrolled in the U.S. higher educational system in the academic year 1984-85. Although the total number of students was only slightly increased (.09%) over the previous year, the nationality of the students had changed significantly. The IIE report indicates that there was a 42 percent increase of South and Far east Asian students and a decline of Middle East, Latin American and African students. Of particular interest to this study, Japan was ranked 8th among the leading countries with 13,160 students.

With an increased global awareness and opportunity for students and teachers to travel to other countries for educational purposes, it is apparent that our educators and students need to be prepared for the cultural differences they will encounter in the classroom.

Problems in the Classroom. The culturally mixed class, such as the ESL classroom, is a prime example of an environment where the teacher and students often have different expectations of one anothers' roles, behaviors and interaction patterns. These differences can often lead to problems in the classroom. English (1980) explains:

> Teachers and international students alike may find that their expectations about each other are not fulfilled and that the meaning they have always attributed to certain behaviors do not necessarily hold true... Interactions with other individuals may lead to misunderstanding, causing the individual to feel surprised, disappointed, confused, even threatened, defensive, or angry (p.159).

First-hand experiences of this researcher, an ESL teacher, can serve as illustration. A small, seemingly insignificant behavior can be misunderstood resulting in a big problem. For example: South East Asians are taught to show respect to an elder or one of superior status by not giving direct eye-contact. It shows respect to look down. In western cultures, the opposite is true; it is disrespectful not to give someone direct eye-contact. Samovar, Porter, and Jain (1981) relate, "In America we are taught to 'look them in the eye'" (p.173). I have found myself in the past repeating, "Do you understand??," because the recipient of a question had kept his eyes "respectfully" on the floor. Not only was the student avoiding "disrespectful" eye-contact, but the question "Do you understand?" is loaded with cultural overtones. In some cultures a student would never think to tell the teacher that he did not understand because this would be insulting to the teacher--an indication that she/he was not teaching well enough. An ESL teacher once reported that her Vietnamese student "Dong," was rude and uncaring about his class work. When asked how she reached that conclusion, she reported that Dong often smiled or giggled when he did not do well on a test; or when called upon, he did not know the answer. Perhaps Dong was uncaring, or maybe, he was embarassed, upset, or confused (which caused the smile)-- a characteristic common among South East Asians.

Cucullu (1982), an American ESL teacher at a Korean university, noted how cultural differences between the students' and teacher's expectations of one another could affect the classroom environment. She found that the students' perceptions of "acceptable" behavior often conflicted with her own. Students skipped class repeatedly and repor-

tedly "cheated" openly on tests by copying each others papers. These two behaviors were not condoned by Korean professors, yet they were not punishable either. Cucullu found she eventually altered her teaching style as well as changed the students' behavior with certain incentives; they were able to compromise and adapt to one another successfully. Other teachers may not be as sensitive or aware as Cucullu. Smith (1980) relates some difficulties Americans have when teaching in a foreign country:

> I often hear complaints [from nationals] that American graduates don't seem to understand how they should dress, how they should act, what they should expect from their students, or the position they have in the community as teachers (p.13).

He further suggests, "Perhaps a seminar is needed for our ESL M.A. candidates so that our graduates can better understand the role teachers are expected to have in other countries" (p.13).

Sato (1981) investigated the effect of different ethnic styles in classroom discourse. She noted a difference between Asian and non-Asian students. The Asian students were much less likely to participate in classroom activities. This behavior was perceived by some teachers as an unwillingness to participate; they were thus called on less often by teachers. Sato, calling attention to the need for research in the culturally mixed classroom, comments:

> Given its typically multi-ethnic make-up, the English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom is an obvious yet hitherto neglected setting for the study of speech styles and for research on interethnic communication (p.11).

Classroom Centered Research. The literature reviewed showed that the trend in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) research has changed during the past decade. More practical aspects of teaching,

such as classroom interaction patterns are being investigated. "Classroom centered research"— a term coined by Allwright (1983), has become the major focus of many studies. However, most studies found in the literature studied linguistic limitations in the classroom rather than cultural ones.

The literature also reflects a need for further study in interaction patterns in the culturally mixed classroom. "[Sato's study is] an excellent illustration of how classroom process research may serve to refine our understanding of patterns of participation" (Gaies, 1983, p.209). Gaies further comments on the importance of research in the area of classroom interaction:

> In revealing previously unexplored or underdeveloped aspects of classroom processes in which teachers and learners are involved, researchers have developed a greater awareness of and respect for the enormous complexity of language classroom activity (p.215).

Allwright (1983) states that TESL research interests have shifted in the past ten to fifteen years going from "prescription to description and from techniques to process" (p.131). Gaies (1983) notes that "attention has shifted from the nature of input (how a teacher talks in a language classroom) to the nature of the interaction between native speakers and second language acquirers" (p.209). In general, there is a better balance "between the theoretical and practical aspects [of teaching]" (Sukwivat, 1980, p.7). Smith (1980) expresses that TESL programs have dramatically improved over the past ten years, but he feels that "possible interactions between students and teachers should be one of the major concerns of ESL programs" (p.12).

Are the Teachers Prepared? It may be presumed that when teachers

begin to interact with their ESL students or other students in a culturally mixed class, they are automatically prepared to handle the cultural differences between them. However, according to English (1980):

> It is often assumed that persons who enter into ESL teaching bring with them sophisticated intercultural awareness from past experiences and interests, and sometimes this assumption is a fair one. But all too often even experienced ESL teachers find themselves in subtle or complex situation of intercultural misunderstanding which they find difficult to understand, let alone resolve (p.159).

As English (1980) points out, teachers with a culturally mixed class are often not prepared to handle the many differences that may occur. It was found in the literature that many TESL programs neither require nor provide courses in teacher preparation for the inevitable cultural differences found in the ESL classroom. Sukwivat (1980) comments on a study by Palmer Acheson (1977), who surveyed TESL preparation programs in the U.S. and in Britain. In Acheson's findings, only 15% of the programs studied included cultural anthropology as a requirement for teacher trainees; whereas 100% required linguistics (p.70). Sukwivat (1980) admits that there have been changes in TESL programs since the 1977 study--programs are becoming broader providing more aspects of language education (p.70). However, the objectives she states for TESL programs, based on the objectives of the department of ESL at the university of Hawaii in 1980, still exclude mention of preparing the teacher for cultural differences. "Graduates are expected to have knowledge of the theoretical foundations in linguistics, psychological, and sociological aspects of language" (p.70)

Concerned with graduate TESL programs, Ochsner (1980) reviewed 428

Comprehension Examinations (CE) in 14 TESL Master programs to get a general indication of how well teachers are being trained. He found that "we largely ignore these subject areas: history of the English language, proxemics, (kinesics), sociolinguistics, and culture" (p.11). Ochsner found a 6% frequency of questions on CE's pertaining to culture; only 2% pertained to American culture. "Culture" was used as a catch-all term for five separate items including: American culture, literature, stylistics, proxemics and philosophy of language (p.10). Evidence shows that teachers and students in culturally mixed classrooms are often unaware of the source of misunderstandings which often result in confusion and frustration. The recent TESL research focusing on the classroom seems to call for a study on the interaction patterns between teachers and students and the roles they play in the classroom.

In summary, the literature clearly identifies problems in the culturally mixed classroom that stem from differing behaviors and expectations of teachers and students who share different cultural backgrounds. The intercultural aspect of the culturally mixed classroom needs further investigation and the trend in classroom-centered research allows for a study such as this one. Perhaps with the presence of new trends in TESL research, TESL programs will shift their interests towards classroom centered issues and concentrate on preparing the teacher with the skills needed to interact in a culturally mixed classroom. Although there is a wealth of information available that describes the normative classroom behaviors in the U.S., no study was found that drew a comparison of these behaviors to another culture.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to (1) discover normative U.S. classroom teacher and student roles; (2) contrast these to one other culture, Japan and (3) anticipate the difficulties both teachers and students would face if placed in a culturally mixed class unaware of the cultural differences between them. This study will also (4) extend selected theoretical issues beyond the context of cultural differences between the U.S. and Japan to other cultures.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter will be divided into two parts. The first part will examine role behaviors and expectations as part of our culturally learned behaviors. It will also explore the out-of-awareness aspect of behavior in terms of what happens in an intercultural encounter. Finally it will discuss cultural self-awareness as a skill in facilitating understanding of cultural differences with special emphasis on the classroom. The second part of this chapter will describe the U.S. classroom. An historical overview will be provided and definitions of the ideal teacher, specific roles of teachers and students as well as the interaction patterns between them will be discussed.

PART I

Role Defined

In extensive research on roles and role theory, Nadal (1980) found that role is defined in terms of 5 basic catagories: 1) performance, 2) expectation, 3) behavior, 4) social function, and 5) a communicative process and patterning. All five catagories are interrelated and difficult to define alone without consideration of the other catagories.

In the definition of "role" as performance, Rich (1974) says that it is "a set of behaviors that is enacted" (p.65). As these behaviors are enacted, expectations are attached to them. We expect certain

behaviors from certain roles. For example: a doctor should diagnose an illness and prescribe medicine; parents are expected to raise children to be healthy individuals; and students are expected to go to class and do their home work. Hoyle (1969), cited by Nadal (1980), says that "role is a concept including patterns of behavior associated with a position and also patterns of expectation held by the role occupant as well as those expected by society" (p.8). "The expectations of a performance in a role depend on how the individual and significant other people interpret that role" (Friedrich, Galvin, and Book, 1976, p.10). Roles as they are enacted provide a sense of predictability which is expected and wanted within a culture. Rich (1974) says: "We know how we must behave and how others must behave...roles limit the number of unknowns we must face and hence diminish the anxiety of social interaction" (p.67). Nadal (1980) points out that "not all people in a given role behave alike, but that there are boundaries beyond which one may not pass and still find approval (p.8).

Role as a social function, Nadal found, is advocated by sociologists on the whole. They tend to regard role more within the context of society. Berger and Luckman (1967) remark that "institutions are embodied in individual experience by means of roles" (p.74). They further state that in any society roles are essential for the individual to interact in the social world. Stewart (1972) adds that roles are provided in every culture in order to integrate its members into each society as functioning and contributing members (p.59). Role expectations help maintain the social order and control in a society. (Rich p.67).

Nadal (1980) notes that "persons interested in communication process among members of a society view role in terms of its function in determining the nature of the communicative act" (p.9). Ruesch (1974) states "used in connection with communication the term role refers to nothing but the code which is used to interpret the flow of message" (p.160).

In summary, roles are defined as an intricate part of the society allowing us to communicate with predictablility within the context of our culture. Some regard roles as the back bone of the society holding together social order and control. Others define roles as concepts that require certain behaviors expected from a society. To synthesize the above definitions, it can be said that roles and their behaviors are culturally learned. In the most general sense, culture is the determining factor behind role behaviors. Hall (1959) explains that people within a culture acquire the knowledge of how to interact in their society through formal and informal learning (p.68-69). Nadal (1980) points out, "one must keep in mind that these behaviors and expectations are culturally determined and not necessarily common to other cultural groups" (p.14). In order to understand the process through which we learn our role behaviors, it's necessary to define and understand the influence of culture.

Culture and its Function

Samovar, Porter, and Jain (1981) define culture formally as:

> the deposit of knowledge, experiences, beliefs, value, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, timing, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving (p.24).

Essentially, culture provides the frame work through which we learn to understand the world we live in. Hall (1977) remarks that "one of the functions of culture is to provide a highly selective screen between man and the outside world" (p.85). Harris and Moran (1982) define culture as an adaptation of the physical and biological environment in which we live. "It is communicable knowledge, learned behavioral traits that are shared by participants in a social group manifested in their institutions and artifacts" (p.64).

Porter and Samovar (1982) further define culture as a pattern for living, by which we "learn to think, believe, feel, and strive for what [our] culture considers proper" (p.31). In this sense, culture is a teacher of sorts. Pusch (1981) relates that the "ways of thinking and perceiving are culturally conditioned rather than being universal aspects of human nature" (p.7). It goes without saying that cultures differ since "culture is the unique life style of a particular group of people" (Harris and Moran, 1982, p.64).

Culture and Communication

It's impossible to discuss culture without mentioning communication since the two are inseparable (Hall 1959, Condon and Yousef 1977, Prosser 1978, Porter and Samovar 1982). Porter and Samovar (1982) say that culture not only determines who talks to whom, about what, and in what way, but it also dictates how communicative acts are received, interpreted, and sent; as well as the behaviors involved in these acts (p.32). In other words, every time we are interacting with another individual, our culture is dictating the way the interaction is handled.

The communication setting is perceived and interpreted in terms of one's own culture.

The observable part of culture is our behavior. Porter and Samovar explain that patterns of language and forms of activity and behavior are manifested through culture (p.31). It is believed that about 35 percent of what is communicated is verbal, the rest is transmitted through nonverbal behaviors (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, 1981, p.155). How we dress, act, interact, move etc, are all regulated by our nonverbal behavior which is largely, as will be discussed, out of our awareness and culturally bound. Interestingly, research has shown that nonverbal behaviors are believed over the verbal when the spoken and nonverbal messages are contradictory (Devito, 1982, p.183). Hills (1979) remarks that "nonverbal signals can give emphasis and force to a spoken message and may often show more accurately what the person speaking really feels" (p.34).

Value Systems

Harris and Moran (1982) indicate that it is the value system of a culture which sets the norms of behavior in a society (p.67). A value system, in a sense the unobservable part of culture, is deeply apart of each person in a given culture. It is unobservable in that we can "see" values only in our behavior. "Values tell us how we should behave" (Rich, 1974, p.100). Samovar, Porter, and Jain (1981) define cultural values as normative aspects of a given culture which tell one what is good and bad, right and wrong, true and false, positive and negative, etc. (p.41).

Cultural values provide us with choices of behavior. Samovar,

Porter, and Jain (1981) say that our values "specify what behaviors are of importance and which should be avoided within a culture" (p.41). Grove (1982) feels that "our supposedly 'natural' values and behaviors are actually choices from among a vast range of potential alternatives available to humans" (p.8).

The Educational System

The influence of culture runs deep in the institutions of a society. "The entire educational system, together with all the rules and procedures for proper classroom interaction, reflect a cultural dictate rather than a universal mandate" (Andersen 1984, p.161).

Several studies clearly show that society directly influences the structure of school, and the classroom; and the behaviors of teacher and student-- as well as the choice of curriculum, the manner in which it is taught and how it is interpreted (Adams 1969, Sussman 1974, Fain and Shostak 1979, Levine and Adelman 1982, Andersen 1984). Levine and Adleman (1982) state: "The manner in which education is provided in any country reflects basic cultural and social beliefs of that country" (p.161).

Out-of-Awareness Behavior

Culture influences us in such a way that we are often not cognizant of the "potential alternatives" as Grove (1982) earlier indicated and the "effect of culture on our lives is largely unrealized" (Porter and Samovar 1982, p.31). Condon (1977) comments that much of our behavior is outside of our awareness. We seem to do "what comes naturally" without the realization that our behaviors have been culturally

determined. Porter and Samovar (1982) analogize culture's effect to the use of a computer. "As we program computers to do what they do, our culture to a great extent programs us to do what we do and to be what we are. Our culture affects us in a deterministic manner from conception to death" (p.31).

This out-of-awareness tendency comes from the fact that our behavior becomes so internalized that we fail to see that it is learned and culturally relevant. Harris and Moran (1982) point out:

> The group or race become unconscious of the origin of this fund of wisdom [cultural habits]. Subsequent generations are conditioned to accept such "truths" about life around them, certain taboos and values are established, and in a multitude of ways people are informed of the "accepted behavior for living in that society (p.63).

Berger and Luckman (1967) call this process "habitualization". The objective world becomes internalized and thus becomes subjectively real (p.74).

Assumption of Similarity

Due to this tendency to be unaware of our behavior and value assumptions, we often make the mistake of assuming similarity across cultures. If asked to describe a classroom, most of us would describe an environment we had experienced ourselves. "People tend to think of the learning environment they are most familiar with as somehow representative of learning environments in general..." (Andersen, 1984, p.161). Assuming similarity among cultures can be a serious mistake. Defined as a stumbling block to communication, Barna (1982) contends that "each of us seems to be so unconsciously influenced by our own cultural upbringings that we at first assume that the needs, desires,

and basic assumptions of others are the same as our own" (p.323). Condon and Yousef (1977) comment, "it is only when we go outside of our territory that we realize not everyone behaves in the same way... good advice at home may be very bad advice elsewhere" (p.4).

Encountering Differences

Having an intercultural encounter triggers our deep-set value system into motion. "People whose experience has been limited to the norms of their own culture often misinterpret a communication based on a different set of norms" (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, 1981, p.61). Harris and Moran (p.63) say that "we each tend to view other peoples' behavior in the context of our own background". We might feel uncomfortable and uneasy in a situation where the same cultural background is not shared. Prosser (1978) explains:

> Values are the most deep-seated aspects of culture and often cause the greatest cultural conflict when they impede upon cultural communication. They lead to behavior which seems irrational to those who do not share the same values (p.303).

As Greenbaum and Greenbaum (1983) point out, "value conflicts are essentially inadvertant" (p.29). This could be due to the fact that we act "naturally," unaware of our culture's imprint on our behavior. They further emphasize this point:

> Behaviors involved in regulating interaction are on the periphery of awareness. Unlike differences in spoken language, two different nonverbal systems can be in use without either interactant being explicity aware of it (p.17).

For example, someone such as an international student who recognizes that the behavior of his classmates is different from what he or she is accustomed to, may try to adjust his/her behavior to fit into the class. This may be done inappropriately as Stewart (1972) points out in refer-

referring to the result of a foreign student trying to change his behavior. He states:

> If a student attempts to deviate from his own educational traditions and participate actively in the classroom, he may over-react, monopolizing too much time and speaking dogmatically. To his instructor, he now appears arrogant and domineering (p.7).

Both the professor and student are classic examples of bringing their "cultural baggage" (Prosser, 1978, p.5) into the communication setting. We can see that each of them is evaluating the other based on his own cultural background.

Learning Cultural Self-Awareness

Teachers can learn to ease the cultural differences evident in the culturally mixed classroom. Many contend that the developement of cultural self-awareness is essential for acquiring skills needed to be effective and understanding in the classroom; as well as being able to resolve culturally related problems (English 1980, Sullivan 1981, Cucullu 1982, Jenkins 1983, Irving 1984, Heck 1984). Cultural self-awareness essentially means having the "awareness of the cultural patterns that influence our own perception, thinking, encoding, and other communication behaviors" (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, 1981, p.60). It is very difficult to analyze our own behavior objectively, as cultural self-awareness suggests, since we often forget our behavior is learned and not inherent. Yet, without cultural self-awareness, we are unable to realize that our choices of behavior are generally determined by our culture. Grove (1982) feels that this awareness can help change the ethnocentric attitudes one holds (p.8). Samovar, Porter, and Jain (1981) say: "We gain from cultural self-awareness a perspective or

frame of reference for identifying cultural similarities and cultural differences between ourselves and others" (p.63). Being able to identify such similarities and differences allows one to begin to resolve misunderstandings that stem from the cultural differences present in the classroom. Heck (1984) remarks:

> ...with a knowledge of their own cultural values and prejudices, teachers become more sensitive to subconscious reactions to students and situations ...With a better understanding of the cultural traditions and values that are brought to the learning situation by both teacher and students, the teacher may incorporate this information into the structure of the learning environment (p.54).

Fain (1979), when considering education in the United States, supports the notion that awareness of cultural differences is a necessity for the U.S. educator. He comments that:

> Public education in the United States tends to reflect the cultural values and standards of white, middle-class America and for this very reason teachers must be alert to cultural diversity in their classroom (p.245).

In summary, it has been stated that the roles of a society and the manner in which they are enacted are largely determined by the cultural values of that society. These behaviors become so internalized in the culture that they normally remain out of one's awareness. It is when one is faced with difference that they may come to awareness. Research shows that one key to understanding cultural differences is to have the awareness of one's own culture. Cultural awareness allows us to look at ourselves as cultural beings and help us understand the cultural differences we may encounter.

PART II

Before moving on to the next part of this chapter it is important to note that when references are made to "American values" or U.S. norms, it needs be understood that these are generalizations of mainstream U.S. culture. Condon and Yousef (1977) mention that when referring to cultural values by national names, one should note that "these [values] should be interpreted as referring to those values that seem dominant within that society and which are most often associated with that society" (p.49). It should also be understood that there are many subcultures in the U.S. with values that vary from the mainstream. Samovar, Porter, and Jain (1981) say that the U.S. society is has such a range of cultural patterns that "a common core of cultural patterns that could be said to hold for our whole population would have to be kept very general" (p.66). They further indicate that "dominant American cultural patterns" encompass those of the white middle-class in this country; and those cultural patterns shared by those of other distinct and/or racial groups constitute subcultural variations of American cultural patterns.

The American Classroom

It was mentioned before that if asked to describe a classroom, most of us would describe one out of our own experience. It is likely that a common experience of most persons who have attended school in the United States will be in the following: Upon entering a high school or university class, students usually select the seat or desk where they will sit. These seats are not assigned by the teacher who usually enters the class just as the period should start. The teacher and students may

greet each other informally with a hello or good morning. Students are expected to remain quiet in their seats unless called upon to make an inquiry, or add to the discussion. Students look attentive by giving the teacher eye-contact and an occasional head nod. The teacher, who usually remains at the head of the class, talks to the class as a group but attempts to make each student feel as if the work involves him/her personally (Hills, 1979, p.37).

Teachers often encourage student participation and direct involvement in the instruction. They address students by their given names and students in turn address their teachers by their surname or title plus surname, for example, Professor Johnson or Dr./Mr/Mrs. Johnson. This practice however, is less strict in the university and some students feel comfortable to address their teachers by their given name. This, of course depends on the particular teacher, the type of course, and the teaching style in the classroom.

As the class period nears an end, students begin to shuffle papers and pack up their books in order to dash from the room as soon as the alloted time for the class is over. If the teacher is quick enough and has timed the class so it ends when the period does, he/she will be able to excuse the class. Often, students will leave when the clock says it is time-- not when the teacher does.

The above scenerio provides a general picture of life in the U.S. classroom. The rest of this chapter will take a deeper look into this American phenomenon.

Historical Change. Regarding the historical evolution of education in the U.S., many changes have occured yet many traditions have re-

mained. For example, in the classroom environment, rectangular rooms with bolted down desks set in rows have, in some cases, have been transformed into modular "open" classrooms allowing students to roam freely (Getzels, 1975). However, the "open" classroom, an innovation of the 1970's, has yet to become the norm for classrooms. Instead, most instruction continues to occur in the context of a more traditional classroom —square or rectangular with decks placed in rows (Friedrich 1982, Todd-Mancillas 1982). Walter Doyle (1979) remarks the "alternatives to the classroom have seldom demonstrated their superiority and often fade back into conventional classroom forms" (p.143).

Although many changes have occured in this century, some researchers contend that certain characteristics of the classroom have remained relatively stable. "[The American classroom] appears to be one of the most consistent and persistent phenomena known in the social and behavioral sciences" (Sirotnik, 1983, p.17). Larry Cuban (1982) who studied teaching practices from 1890 to 1980, concludes that:

> These practices (teaching the whole group, reliance upon a textbook, rows of desks, question answer framework for carrying on dialogue, etc.) persisted over time, in different settings in spite of change in teacher education and the knowledge that students bring to school and major social and cultural movements. Yet, there are variations in this pattern (p.165).

Cuban points out the stability in teaching practices, but he does note that "there are variations in this pattern;" which indicates that change has occured in the U.S. educational system. An example of a variation can be noted in the nature of the interaction between the teacher and students. Questions asked of students have changed in the past 60 years. Nuthall and Snook (1973) note:

> It is probable that the frequency of questions calling for recall of information and repetition of practiced responses has declined, and the frequency of questions requiring pupils to give opinions, make and draw conclusions has increased proportionately (p.52).

Fain (1979) points out that change is inevitable in education.

> The only certainty in education is change. Education moves through one historical period to another, from the society-centered to the child-centered, not unlike a great pendulum with a chain that becomes shorter with every swing. The pendulum returns but never to the exact position it held formerly (Fain, 1979, p.99).

The role of the teacher and student and their expectations of one another have changed notably during the past century. Goble (1977) considers the role of the teacher in today's world of "global morality" as one of helping his/her students understand the community at the international level. He reflects on how the role of the teacher has changed:

> ...the teacher no longer [can] be seen as the transmitter of what is already orthodox, the purveyor of materials previously prepared in terms of established ideas, the obedient actor in a context that is not of his making, but as prophet, initiator, creator of curriculum, designer of the learning context, engaged in a sustained and deliberate effort to modify the tastes of his students and so, by influencing their acceptance or rejection of messages embodied in taboo and mythology, to accelerate change in the central stock of the ideas of the society (p.35).

The library shelves are full of books, journals and magazines which present innovative teaching methods, historical overviews, statistical studies and projections on the future of education in this country. After perusing many of these, several themes were discovered that ran through the literature concerning teaching methods, the definition of an "effective" teacher, the interactive patterns of teachers and students, and normative behaviors found in the classroom which often reflect

values in the American society.

The U.S. Teacher

The Effective Teacher.

Many studies in the reviewed literature give definitions of an effective teacher. Most show the genuine concern teachers have for their students and how they are able to adapt their teaching styles to accommodate the needs of the students. However, Ornstein (1985) points out that "Teaching is a complex act, and no single factor can entirely explain or describe the qualities of a 'good' or 'effective' teacher" (p.27). Many resourses in the literature indicate that there is no single method of teaching or conducting a class that is superior to all others; or constitutes an effective teacher (Adams 1969, Williams 1980, Hawley and Rosenholtz 1984, Pellicer 1984). Williams (1980) suggests that: "The assumption the teacher makes about the purpose of schooling, the learning process, and the learner serve as the first filter for the selection of any teaching method" (p.85). Keeping this in mind, let's look at how others have defined the effective teacher.

Hawley (1984) says that "good teachers are essentially adaptive--that is, they alter what they do to take into account the learning goals of a lesson, the resources available and students needs" (p.16). The literature clearly suggests that the teacher is extremely concerned with students' reaction to the instructional methods used in the classroom. "Regardless of the method the teacher selects, the instructor seeks a response indicating acceptance by the students" (Fain, 1979, p.134). Hawley (1984) describes an effective teacher as one who does the following:

> a) optimizes academic learning time, b) rewards achievement in appropriate ways, c) utilizes "interactive" teaching practies d) holds and communicates high expectations for student performance, and e) selects the appropriate unit of instruction (p.15).

Many authors say that keeping the interest of the student and encouraging a motivational atmosphere are important factors determining the effectiveness of the teacher. "The teacher must decide how to entertain his or her audience while attending to the curriculum" (Shavelson and Stern, 1981, p.465). The concept to "entertain" the students was found elsewhere in the literature. In referring to the use of humor in the classsroom, Ziegler, Boardman, and Thomas (1985) found that it can "promote flexibility, facilitate communication, provide alternative perspectives, and create a feeling of goodwill" (p.346). It can be assumed that having a good time in the U.S. classroom can enhance the learning environment. Many teachers believe that being "entertained" in the classroom has very positive results for the student. "Teaching is going well when the pupils are responding with enthusiasm, when they look alert and interested" (Nuthall and Snook, 1973, p.53).

Nuthall and Snook further note that maintaining some degree of informality in the classroom is important—i.e. providing entertainment and remaining flexible. They note that by having an informal atmosphere, lessons are allowed to follow the students interest more closely rather than the structure imposed by the subject matter (p.53).

The results of a university of Arizona study on effective teaching suggests that students prefer and tend to describe an effective instructor as one who "motivates students for maximum learning, presents materials in an interesting way, clearly explains course content, and

accomplishes course objectives" (Mishra, 1980, p.62). Though dated, Gran (1958) defines the ideal teacher in terms that are relevant today:

> An ideal high-school teacher is one who has a general knowledge and understanding of teenagers as a group and who knows the pupils in his classes as individuals. He is fair, impartial, friendly, and compassionate (p.216).

Clark (1976) states: "The teacher must base his practice on firm knowledge of the nature of the learner, the nature of the teaching process and the nature of the subject matter" (p.3). For a final definition of an effective teacher, Pellicer (1984), points out the results of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES), conducted by the California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing:

> Effective teachers appeared to have an indepth knowledge of the subject area and the ability to recognize differences between students in terms of study preferences, cognitive ability, and levels of previous learning. This combination of knowledge and ability allowed teachers to diagnose where students were in relation to learning objectives and thus provided a solid basis for instructional planning (p.55).

It is obvious that teaching is complex and dynamic in nature. There are individual differences among teachers and students. What works for one teacher and/or class might not work for another (Ornstein, 1985). An effective teacher realizes the many components of teaching; not only does she/he know the instructional material, she/he knows the "how" of presenting it as well as the students capabilities, and is able to package the material for effective communication (Fain, 1979, p.20).

To summarize the characteristics that make a teacher effective, besides being knowledgeable in the subject area, it can be said that a "good" teacher is adaptive, concerned with and understands the students, uses interactive teaching methods, keeps the interest and attention of the students as well as being interesting, and motivating to students to

help them achieve the objectives of the class.

Teacher Roles. The teacher's role can be defined in many ways. One convenient way is to consider the sub-roles that constitute the role of teacher and the behaviors associated with these sub-roles. For example, the teacher is defined as the leader in the classroom, the motivator, the dispenser of knowledge and an effective organizer of time and subject matter. Associated with these roles are numerous behaviors that will be examined further in the following discussion.

It is clear that a teacher does not only dispense knowledge, but rather follows specific role behaviors that correspond with expectations of the society. Some behaviors or practices, Nuthall and Snook (1973) point out, have survived the passing pressures "imposed by parents, administrators, curriculum innovators, and teacher-training programs" (p.53). They are included in the following as a "should or have to" list of expectations for teachers. Even though the following list is from a study on elementary students and this present study focuses on the high school and college level of education, it is worth reporting because it exemplifies how early some expectations of behavior start in the educational process.

(a) pupils must be kept active and busily engaged in intellectually relevant activities;

(b) teachers should avoid telling pupils when pupils can tell themselves;

(c) questions stimulate pupil thinking and pupils should be made to think about the subject matter;

(4) it is the teacher's duty to monitor pupil understanding of subject matter by asking further appropriate questions (Nuthall and Snook, p.53).

Regarding specific sub-roles of the teacher, behaviors and expectations in the classroom, Friedrich, Galvin, and Book (1976) cite author Richard D. Mann (1970) from his book The College Classroom: Conflict, Change and Learning. Mann has determined that teachers can be categorized into different roles: that of an "Expert," a "Formal Authority/Evaluator," a "Facilitator/Resource," "Socialization Agent," and a "Person."

As the "Expert," the teacher is primarily a "disseminator of information." The way in which a teacher does this depends upon the subject matter, class, and learning styles of the students. Presenting information effectively to the students is the goal and essential at this level of teacher role behaviors. Mann adds the format could be lecture, discussion, or individual work.

In the role as "Formal Authority/Evaluator," the teacher is re garded as the leader in the class.

> This role is defined by legal, social, or institutional norms which require teachers to maintain the rules and regulations of the institution and to assess and report the achievement and behavior of students (p.40).

He adds, however, in the U.S., students often feel they can challenge the authority of the teacher by protesting grades or classroom policies. In this situation, "teachers are put in a position of reacting, defending, or justifying their authority and/or ability to evaluate" (p.40). Having the ability or freedom to question authority stems from the value of democracy in this country. Condon and Yousef (1977) comment on the democratic view of authority in an organization. They say that the authority figure "is obliged to solicit the opinions of all members and act according to their wishes" (p.76). In a study on

student expectations of teachers, Whittaker (1985) found that:

> The claim that students hate authority is not true. Students do resent the authoritarian use of authority. Students want and need benign authority. They need for the teacher to exhibit understanding, knowledge, and decision making. They do not want teachers to show the authority of punishment, ridicule, threats, indifference, pressure, or force (p.56).

The role of authority is handled differently by different teachers. As Friedrich, Galvin, and Book (1976) point out, one teacher may maintain strict control over the class allowing students to speak only when called upon, another teacher may encourage a more relaxed class and allow the students to speak freely among themselves. "The actual way in which an individual teacher performs the role of formal authority depends upon his/her personal style and the relational norms established between the teacher and the students" (p.40).

The ability for students to challenge and disagree appears in the teacher role of "Facilitator/Resource" in which the teacher plays a more indirect role allowing students more control in the class. "The teacher-as-facilitator may encourage student participation and interaction in class discussion and may praise and encourage student ideas" (p.41). In reference to the teacher in the same role, Heck (1984) explains:

> Teachers must create a climate that permits freedom of thinking beyond the classroom--a supportive environment in which students feel free to take risks, make mistakes, question, explore, and disagree (p.74).

Encouragement for students to state their beliefs and not just what the teacher wants to hear is part of the "Socialization Agent" role where the teacher upholds the democratic principle of freedom of speech to encourage students to accept responsibility for their right and

privilege to communicate freely in this society (Friedrich, Galvin, and Book, 1976, p. 40-41). Here, as in the facilitator role, students are allowed the opportunity to question authority if they feel it is needed.

The "Ego Ideal" role portrays the "teacher as a model who is emulated by students." Friedrich, Galvin, and Book further explain this role as a powerful one because the influence of a teacher's performance can affect the self-concepts and later performances of students. How a teacher presents him/her self in a class and how that behavior is perceived, can contribute to their overall opinion of that teacher. A teacher may be respected for being knowledgeable in the subject matter but not especially liked or admired as a person (p.42).

The final role described by Mann (1970), is the "Teacher as Person" role which plays an important part in shaping positive student/teacher relationships in the U.S.

> ...teachers, like students, have needs, and that these needs have to be met or considered at times for satisfactory interaction between teacher and student...this allows the teacher to share things about him/herself with the students that go beyond the focus of the course or the educational setting...(p.42).

Heck (1984) also examines the role of teacher as person in terms of self enrichment and self-awareness. According to Heck, it is the teacher who ultimately "becomes the curriculum"--that is, the teacher makes the difference between learning and not learning for students. If the teacher is bored or unhappy with the subject matter, this attitude will be reflected to the students and there is a good chance that the students will react in a similar way to the subject matter.

Some studies have broken teacher role behaviors down into specific categories or blocks of time. In a study by Clark, Smith, Newby and

Cook (1985), 71 teachers were observed in order to identify teaching behaviors. The study identified 1,346 different behaviors from which six categories of behaviors were made. The results showed that:

(1) 30 percent were sorted into the "Instructing and Presenting" category

(2) 26 percent into the "Reinforcing" category;

(3) 21 percent into the "Managing" category;

(4) 13 percent in the "Drill and Practice" category;

(5) 06 percent into the "Enrichment, Timeout and Fill Activities" category; and

(6) 04 percent into the "Student Evaluation" category.

Nuthall and Snook (1973) discuss the time teachers spend on classroom activities. They found that many pertain to classroom management. They report on a study by Gump (1967) who found that on an average, teachers spent:

(1) 51 percent of their time in instructional activities;

(2) 23 percent of their time structuring and organizing the behavior of the pupils;

(3) 14 percent of their time admonishing, giving permission, and dealing with deviant behavior;

(4) 12 percent of their time in other activities including dealing with individual problems (p.54).

A final note of importance is detailed by Friedrich, Galvin, and Book (1976); teachers must remain flexible in their sub-role choices. The learning environment is a dynamic ever changing process. The teacher must be sensitive to variables of this process and be able to detect the needs of the present situation and fulfill the roles necessary to meet those needs (p.46-47). According to them, there is more emphasis placed on the flexibility of roles for both teachers and

students in today's U.S. classroom and distinct differences between the two, such as superiority and inferiority, are down played. This is due to the many different learning styles today that are replacing the formal lecture-style format (p.10).

As the research shows, the expectations of teachers are numerous and complex and certainly not confined to those so far outlined. Yet, it is felt that those that have been presented provide the fundamental basis to understanding the teacher in the U.S. classroom. Teachers obviously are not alone in the classroom and they can not function in these roles without the students, who also play a highly significant part in the classroom. These specific student role behaviors will be discussed next.

The U.S. Student

From a very early age, students learn how to behave in the classroom. They learn what is expected of them and what to expect from their teachers. Most are a part of the educational system from twelve to eighteen years and during this time they choose to what degree they want to conform to the structure of the system. It is obvious that there are countless variations among students as there are among teachers. "The feeling students have toward the social system and context of the academic environment may affect their role choices and behavior in the classroom" (Friedrich, Galvin, and Book, 1976, p.55). In the following definitions of student roles and ideal student behaviors it should be understood that these are generalizations and do not claim to represent all students.

Expected Student Role Behaviors. Within the U.S. educational system there are certain behaviors that are expected of students to learn in the classroom. Student roles are shown by what students do in the classroom and what is expected of them. Beginning in elemetary school, they learn to raise their hands when they want to speak, to sit still and be attentive, to nod their heads at appropriate times and to do what pleases the teacher (Friedrich, Galvin, and Book, p.55). These behaviors are part of the role expected of the student; which are noticed as normative behaviors mostly when students deviate from them. For example, if a student has always spoken in class only after raising his/her hand and/or being called upon, it is difficult for that student to speak out spontaneously during a class discussion (p.55).

Behaviors expected of students are outlined by Hills (1979). The student's output in the classroom is in the form of verbal and nonverbal interchanges with the teacher and other students, written work and tests. Hills further explains these outputs which come in forms of:

a) questions or replies to questions by the student to the teacher or other students.

b) student giving a short presentation on a particular topic in front of a seminar group

c) completing a written assignment, an essay, report, piece of practical work or handing in a set of completed problems.

d) completing a test or exmamination (p.74).

Brophy (1981) discusses ideal student roles as being attending, contributing to lessons and working carefully and successfully on assignments. He found that teacher frustration and classroom problems occured when students did not fulfill the ideal student role criteria even though the students might be attractive sociably and personally.

"Students are called upon to display knowledge and skills; they take tests, complete assignments, answer questions in discussions, and so forth (Doyle, 1979, p.141). By their performance, the teacher evaluates them and issue grades or some other type of evaluation that lets the student know where he/she stands. Doyle discusses the effect this evaluation process has on how the students define the academic task and how the subject matter will be processed and thus learned. A learner must acquire the keen ability to selectively process the information presented in class. Doyle concludes that knowledge of the subject matter is not enough for learning in the classroom. He states:

> To accomplish classroom tasks, a student must acquire a special set of skills to identify task demands, adjust perceptions of these demands as they fluctuate over time, and compensate for the lack of complete information (p.141).

The Active Learner. In the U.S., it is obvious that students are not passive observers in the classroom; they are an active part of the learning process.

> Learners are not simply recipients of instruction. Their thinking, feeling, and reacting are of great importance. Students should be actively engaged in creating and recreating their environments (Heck, 1984, p.74).

Lowman (1984) observes that students are "in no way passive pawns in the classroom game, doing just as instructed and keeping their emotions to themselves" (p.39). Rather, he explains, students express through their classroom behavior their personal feelings and expectations towards their teacher. This is done through the kinds of questions they ask, the quality of work they produce, the way they respond to questions, etc.

Teacher and Student Interaction

It's important to keep in mind that the classroom is an interactive system. The teacher, the objectives, the student, and the environment all interact to affect which teaching strategy is best for a particular lesson (Cooper, 1981, p.77). Doyle (1979) remarks:

> First, classroom relationships are reciprocal. Students therefore, play an important role in shaping the way teachers behave. Second, teachers face a complex set of demands engendered by the distinctive features of the classroom environment (p.139).

Stewart (1972) looks at the interaction between the teacher and student as a "transaction" since it is viewed as a constantly changing, dynamic interaction in which both parties are changed because of their interaction (p.11-12). "The transaction view stresses the simultaneous nature of sending and receiving messages" according to Cooper (1981) who further states:

> Communication becomes complex, dynamic and continuous--a process in which each individual gets her/his identity from participation in the communication event (p.6).

Friedrich, Galvin, and Book, (1976) note that in the transactional nature of the classroom, teachers and students:

> affect each other and are affected--changed-- by their interactions...as [they] participate in this dynamic, continuous process, they respond to the demands of the situation as they perceive them and to the roles other are playing (p.57).

Based on the Nuthall and Snook study (1973) on teaching models, Friedrich (1982) categorizes instructional activities of classrooms into three basic forms. They are worth noting here:

1. Individual Work - the student is working on his or her own. Individual work accounts for between 25 and 45 percent of all class time.

2. Extended Discourse - the teacher is talking, performing, demonstrating, or exhibiting materials. Extended discourse accounts for between 18 and 22 percent of all class time.

3. Interactive Discourse - the teacher and students are talking with each other. The degree of teacher control varies. Interactive discourse accounts for between 34 and 53 percent of all class time.

Friedrich's category of "Interactive Discourse" seems less clear than the detailed passage provided by Nuthall and Snook (1973) who indicate that:

> 20 to 30 percent of the time engaged in the question-answer type of recitation or discussion with students (often interspersed with short lectures); and 14 to 23 percent of the time combining demonstration or exhibition of material with question-answer type discussion (p.52).

In "playing out" each respected role, the teacher and student create a mode of interaction that can be predictable. In a study done by Shavelson and Stern (1981) interaction patterns in the classroom were investigated. From a composite of previous research, they found that interaction in the clasroom could be characterized by "well-established routines." Further explaining teacher/student interaction, they comment:

> In carrying out the routine, the teacher monitors the classroom, seeking cues, such as student participation, for determining whether the routine is proceeding...the teacher's main concern during interactive teaching is to maintain the flow of activity (p.483-434).

Nuthall and Snook (1973) found that the role of the student in the interactive process is more restrictive than that of the teacher. "Their primary task is to answer questions--to reply when called on." Even though each student is expected "to respond no more than six or seven times in an hour, he/she is expected to pay attention to the progress of the lesson" (p.54).

Nonverbal Communication in the Classroom

The nonverbal behavioral norms of the teacher and student affect the communication process in the U.S. classroom. The following aspects of nonverbal behavior are important, yet not inclusive, in the classroom: proxemics, including interpersonal space, distance and territory; kinesics ("body language"), including body movements, eye contact and other facial expressions; and chronemics (time).

Proxemic Behavior in the Classroom. Proxemics can be defined in terms of personal space and territory. In the classroom, students usually sit in the same place every day even though they often have the freedom to change their place--i.e. in a university class. This phenomenon has been observed in many classes. Students sometimes feel that they can ask some one else to move if they happen to be sitting in "their" seat, as if "their" territory has been invaded.

It is well known that persons, including those in the U.S., perceive a "bubble" of space around them. If "their" space is invaded by someone, they may feel very uncomfortable. According to Cooper (1981), more distance is needed between students and teachers then between students and students as an example of personal distance expected between the teacher and students. Teachers often maintain a formal distance from students by standing at the front of the room, standing behind a podium, or sitting behind a desk (Andersen and Andersen, 1982, p.102). In reference to what was earlier discussed regarding authority and informality in the classroom, one could assume that the amount of space maintained by the teacher and students could be in direct relation to the amount formality and authority maintained the classroom. This is

only an assumption since no such correlation was found in the literature. This assumption can extend to other cultures as well. Would there be more distance in a classroom in a culture where strict formality and authority was valued?

The level of comfort and communication in the class can be determined by the seating arrangement. There are a variety of seating arrangements available to the U.S. classroom just as there are teaching methods. As the research has shown, most classrooms are arranged in the traditional rows, where students face the teacher who remains (mostly) at the head of the class. In this traditional setting, the teacher has much more free space than the students as well as control over the students (Friedrich, Galvin, and Book, 1976, p.25). The traditional arrangement also promotes student-teacher interactions and inhibits student to student interaction where as students placed in a horse shoe arrangement or in groups have increased interaction. The teacher can choose his/her seating arrangement to best fit the purpose of the course, lesson or particular teaching style.

Kinesic Behavior in the Classroom. Kinesics, the study of body behavior and movement, "attempts to examine how such things as slight head nods, yawns, postural shifts, and other nonverbal cues, whether spontaneous or deliberate, affect communication" (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, 1981, p.166). Love and Roderick (1971) developed a list of nonverbal behaviors characteristic of elementary and secondary teachers when communicating their attitudes and feelings towards their students. In developing the instrument to record teacher nonverbal behavior, they set two criteria: (1) regardless of grade level and subject area, the

behavior had to be demonstrated by a majority of teachers and (2) the behavior had a singular meaning in our culture rather than related to any individual style or personality (p.295). The selection of nonverbal categories were based on Flanders (1976) categories for analyzing classroom verbal interaction. Though lengthy, the Love and Roderick list provides an excellent description of nonverbal behavior associated with the teacher including the meaning behind each behavior. It is indicated that the group of behaviors presented with each catagory is not intended to be inclusive, but rather to be representative of a sample. The teacher:

1. Accepts student behavior: smiles, affirmatively shakes head, pats on the back, winks, places hand on shoulder or head.

2. Praises student behavior: Places index finger and thumb together, claps, raises eyebrows and smiles, nods head affirmatively and smiles.

3. Displays student ideas: Writes comments on board, puts students' work on bulletin board, holds up papers, provides for nonverbal student demonstation.

4. Shows interest in student behavior: Establishes and maintains eye contact.

5. Moves to facilitate student-to-student interaction: Physically moves into the position of group member, physically moves away from the group

6. Gives directions to students: Points with the hand, looks at specified area, employs pre-determined signal (such as raising hands for students to stand up), reinforces numerical aspects by showing that number of fingers, extends arms forward and beckons with hands, points to student for answers.

7. Shows authority towards students: Frowns, stares, raises eyebrows, taps foot, negatively shakes head, walks or looks away form the deviant, snaps fingers.

8. Focuses students' attention on important points: Uses pointer, walks toward the person or object, taps on something, thrusts head forward, thrusts arm forward, employs a nonverbal movement with a verbal statement to give it emphasis.

9. Demonstrates and/or illustrates: Performs a physical skill, manipulates materials and media, illustrates a verbal statement with a nonverbal action.

10. Ignores student behavior: Lacks nonverbal response when one is ordinarily expected (Love and Roderick, 1971, p.295-296).

In reviewing Albert Mehrabian's (1969) work on nonverbal behaviors, Cooper (1981) discusses behaviors that indicate whether a teacher likes or dislikes his/her students. Cooper states that Mehrabian's research indicates:

> ...that liking compared to disliking, is characterized by more forward lean, closer proximity, more eye contact, more touching, more positive facial expressions, and more openness of arms and body (p.64).

Eye contact between the teacher and students is an important aspect of kinesic behavior in the classroom. "Teachers who use more eye contact can more easily monitor and regulate their classes, and they also communicate more warmth and involvement to their students" (Andersen and Andersen, 1982, p.107). Eye contact signals that there is a willingness to communicate. If students do not want to answer a question or partake in a classroom discussion, they typically look down at their book and avoid eye contact with the teacher (Cooper, 1981, p.64). According to Galloway (1971) direct eye contact usually communicates interest and attention, while lack of it shows disinterest and inattention (p.228). However, staring at students may create anxiety or perhaps hostility (Cooper, 1981, p.64). In Exline's (1971) study reviewed by Cooper, students felt more comfortable "with another who, when speaking,

listening, or sharing mutual silence, looked at them 50 percent of the time rather than 100 percent of the time" (p.64).

The Use of "Time" in the Classroom. Chronemics, the study of time and how it is a part of the communication process, is an important factor in the classroom. Not only is the school day divided into periods, each for a different subject, but each class period is broken into segments of time. A teacher may give 10 minutes to review material, 30 minutes for a quiz, and 10 minutes for individualized work. How a teacher uses time in the classroom can affect the communication and comfort of the students level. Cooper (1981) points out an example: "Too often teachers fail to wait long enough for students to respond to questions. In fact, they seldom wait longer than five seconds! Silence is not golden in the classroom!" (p.69-60). Often, she adds, teachers fearing silence in the classroom, will answer their own questions.

There are other ways time can communicate in the classroom. Students are expected to arrive on time. This expectation begins when students are in grade school. Tardy slips and the use of a bell signal the child that punctuality and time are important and should be respected (Levine and Adelman, 1982, p.153). Students often signal the teacher that the class is nearly over when they begin to pack up their books. Time can even be a punishment when students are expected to stay after school.

For some concluding remarks, Woolfolk and Galloway (1985) discuss how the awareness of and sensitivity towards nonverbal behaviors in the classroom can provide a better understanding of teacher and students interaction and expectations:

> By attending to nonverbal features of classroom interactions we can better understand how students and teacher perceive each other and the events of the classroom. ...we can trace the development of impressions, expectations, responses, and reactions in classroom transactions (p.81).

It is apparent that nonverbal behaviors play an important role in the classroom communication process. Discussion thus far only presents a partial picture of nonverbal behaviors in the classroom; yet it is hoped that it has brought about a new awareness regarding classroom activity.

U.S. Values in the Classroom

As discussed in the previous chapter, society's expectations stem from certain values present in that society. Several mainstream values are reflected in the behaviors of teachers and students in the classroom. Those that were commonly mentioned in the literature were: individualism, equality, rationality, activity of "doing," democratic authority, and mutability (the ability to change). This list represents only some of the predominent values and is by no means complete.

One value that is reflected overwelmingly in classroom behaviors is U.S. individualism. Condon and Yousef (1977) explain that "individualism in the United States is not so much the peculiar characteristics of each person but the sense each person has of having separate but equal place in society" (p.65). They add: "For the child growing up in the United States, these values of equality and independence leading to individualism are introduced and reinforced in many ways" (p.66). The classroom clearly perpetuates these values. Teachers encourage their students to think for themselves and make decisions. This could also reflect the value of self-reliance. Such classroom activites as group

projects, oral reports, open-ended question sessions all reflect this push towards developing the individual as one with a healthy self-concept. Fain (1979) mentions that it is necessary for educators to appreciate each student as an individual (p.240). It's also a well accepted notion that teachers are expected to treat each student equally. Lowman (1984) adds that a teacher can communicate to his/her students that he/she values them as individuals by learning the names of the students (p.49). The very fact that there is no one method to teach a class reflects the attitude towards individualism. Teachers are urged to teach in a manner that best fit their and their students individual needs.

Condon and Yousef (1977) define the value of rationality in terms of the reasonability of a person. They state that:

> [This "person"] can be shown alternatives with the expectation that he will choose the best. He will adhere to criteria and standards which will be accepted by other reasonable men. He can learn (p.93).

Condon and Yousef claim that a culture's emphasis on formal education is a fairly good indication of its assumption of rationality. Those cultures that believe in universal education (for all the people) have a strong belief in rationality. They note that societies that deny education to some of its people, i.e. women, and certain minorities, are "likely to entertain the notion that these people are not fully rational..." (p.93). Heck (1984) demonstrates the strong value of rationality in this country when she says that "one of the most critical responsibilities of teachers as facilitators of learning [in the U.S.] is to create an environment that promotes critical thinking and problem-solving skills" (p.73).

The value of "doing" as opposed to "being-in-becoming," and "being" is apparent in the classroom. By reviewing U.S. classroom behaviors and activities it becomes clear that the teacher and students are always doing someting. Studies such as the one by Clark, Smith, Newby and Cook, 1976, (see page 31) which identified 1,346 different behaviors in the classroom, show the importance of "doing" in this society. "An American identifies himself in terms of his activities ...Children are frequently quizzed on what they want to be when they grow up--meaning what do they want to do" (Condon and Yousef, 1977, p.71).

The authority in the classroom is valued democratically rather than authoritatively. As was pointed out, students can challenge the authority of the teacher by protesting grades and questionning his/her expertise on the subject matter. Students appreciate the teacher who is understanding, knowledgeable and can make decisions rather then one who uses threats and punishment (see page 29).

Condon and Yousef (1977) define mutability as the possibility of change in the human condition (p.99). They say: "Much of educational philosophy...is based on the assumption that learning and change are not only possible but practically inevitable" (p.100). This value of change is evident in the classroom. Students are encouraged to question, take risks, explore and disagree (see page 29). As reported earlier, many things have changed during the century regarding the educational system. For the most part, people regard these changes as good.

It is hoped that the relationship between values and behaviors has become clear. Behaviors are regarded as manifestations of values; and values are maintained, taught and enforced through behaviors.

Conclusion

As the literature has demonstrated, the classroom environment is a highly complex system encompassing roles, role behaviors, expectations, and cultural values. It has been discussed that a role is a position held by a person in society --i.e. the teacher and the student. Certain behaviors are expected from people who hold certain roles. These role behaviors are either verbal or nonverbal; and through these role behaviors, values of a given culture can be identified.

Generalizing, the U.S. classroom is basically an informal non-authoritative environment yet, basically traditional in appearance. Teachers encourage students to participate and add to the overall learning process. There is no one superior teaching method employed by all teachers. Rather teachers are encouraged to choose a method that fits the needs of the students and particular class as well as to adapt their teaching styles to the particular learning environment. Through this process the important values of individualism, self-reliance, rationality, change, democratic authority and more are learned and upheld.

As was suggested in Chapter I, many teachers who teach in a culturally mixed classroom are not prepared for the cultural differences they may face. False assumptions are often made concerning behavior that is not consistent with one's own culturally acceptable behaviors. Now that the U.S. classroom has been reviewed by the literature, this study will empirically review the U.S. classroom and then compare these results to a study that was conducted in Japan by Barna (1986). It is expected that there will be some differences in the classroom behaviors between the U.S. and Japan.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As was stated earlier in the Purpose, in Chapter I, the intent of this study was to create a profile of the U.S. classroom through a literature review, informal observations and a questionnaire. The literature review revealed a number of generalizations about the U.S. classroom. This study then empirically examined the U.S. classroom role behaviors through the analysis of questionnaire data. In addition to the questionnaire, observation checklists were used to present data gathered directly from the U.S. classroom. This profile was then contrasted to a profile of Japanese normative classroom behaviors compiled by LaRay Barna (1986) and based on data obtained from a study she conducted in Japan. The differences found between the two cultures were examined in terms of intercultural communication theory.

Procedural Overview

The instruments used in present study were matched to those used in the Barna (1986) study for comparative purposes. The four instruments used were: the U.S. study questionnaire, the Japan study questionnaire, the U.S. study observation check list and the Japan study observation checklist. The questionnaire from the Barna study was back translated for the present study to ensure that the two were identical. The observation checklist, a form used when observing classroom activity, was

also selected from the Barna study (see appendix for a copy of both instruments). Subjects selected to complete the questionnaire were high school and college students from the Portland area. The observation checklist was used in several high school classes also in the Portland area.

Before the questionnaire could be administered, several approvals were needed. First, an application for review of research project, the questionnaire and a subject consent form were sent to the Human Subjects Research Review Committee at Portland State University. This procedure is necessary when human subjects are used in a study. The application states:

> This required statement asserts that the proposed investigation has had prior review by an independent university committee, and that the procedures to be used (1) protect the rights and welfare of the subjects, and (2) provide for the securing of informed consent from them, and, if persons under the age of 18 are to participate as subjects, the informed consent of parents and guardians.

The study met the requirements for protecting the rights and welfare of the subjects and was subsequently approved.

Secondly, approval was sought when determining the subject population. It was decided that high school and college students were needed for the study. In order to administer the questionnaire to a group of high school students it was necessary to: 1) contact the school district for approval, 2) contact a specific school principle and 3) make arrangements with a teacher for when the questionnaire could be administered. Consent forms had to be sent in advance for subjects under 18 in order to get their parents' signature. It was also necessary to make arrangements to observe classes.

After conducting a reliability test, the reliable items from the questionnaire were statistically analyzed. The results were then compared to the results of the Barna study to determine how classroom role behaviors between the U.S. and Japan differ. The results of the observation checklists were recorded and also compared to the observations made in Japanese high schools. Although this was not done statisically, it provided an opportunity to compare classroom activity between the two cultures.

Research Questions

The answers to the following questions will be addressed:

1. What are the normative U.S. classroom role behaviors and interaction patterns of teachers and students?
2. How do these behaviors differ from those in Japan as determined by the Barna study?

Subject Selection

The questionnaire was completed by 234 student subjects. Of these, 104 were high school students and 130 were college/university students. High school subjects were from two public and one private school in the Portland area. From these schools, 95 questionnaires were gathered. The remaining 9 were obtained from high school age children in families who had participated in a Japanese homestay program in the summer of 1985. Twenty questionnaires were handed out at an orientation meeting and nine were returned by mail after a follow up letter had been sent. College and university subjects were selected from Portland Community College and Portland State University.

To qualify for the study, subjects were required to be from the

U.S. and to have had only brief stays abroad (6 mos. to 2 yrs.). Subjects who indicated that they had studied in other countries for several years or more, were eliminated from the study. All subjects were in high school or college at the time they participated in the study.

Questionnaire Selection and Preparation

The questionnaire selected for the present study was based on one that had been researched and developed by Nadal (1980) in her Master's thesis entitled A Cross-cultural Study of Role Behaviors Pertaining to the Roles of Student and Professor. Nadal developed the questionnaire by compiling a list of 175 role behaviors of professors and students through a literature review, open-ended interviews and questionnaires, and classroom projects assigned to ESL classes at Portland State University. The list was converted into a questionnaire format and then tested in a reliability study. Twenty-five items for the student and nineteen items for the professor role behaviors were retained for the final version of the questionnaire. Nadal chose a seven-point likert-type bipolar adjective scale for her subjects to rank each item qualitatively. The two extremes she chose were "Absolutely desirable" and "Absolutely undesirable." In other words, the questions asked for subjective judgements of approval or disapproval of the behavior.

For the Japanese study, Barna (1986) used the Nadal questionnaire as a beginning point but adapted it to fit her needs in Japan. Several items were also added. She then had it translated into Japanese. This was a lengthy process involving several professional translators. It was then back translated to check for error. After a pilot study, revisions were made. The final draft included 22 student role behaviors

and 29 teacher role behaviors. A five-point likert-type scale was chosen instead of a seven-point scale. This was less objectionable to the Japanese subjects, most of whom had not experienced this type of research questionnaire according to Barna.

On the student-role-behavior list, subjects were asked to rank order each item quantitatively. They were to indicate how often students engaged in the described behaviors in the classroom: 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, and 1 = never. On the teacher-role-behavior list, subjects were asked to qualitatively evaluate each item also on a 5 point scale. They were to indicate how they felt about each described behavior, not whether teachers engaged in these behaviors. The points on the scale were defined as: 5 = very good behavior, 4 = good, 3 = fair, 2 = poor, 1 = very poor behavior. Since it was the intent of this present study to use the Barna questionnaire for comparative purposes, item format and content conformed to that questionnaire.

The Japanese questionnaire in its final form as completed by the Japanese subjects was translated back into English, this time by four Japanese graduate students at Portland State University. All four Japanese translators agreed on the final version of the questionnaire. Interestingly, a few discrepencies were found between this back translation and the original English form given to the translators in Japan The four P.S.U. student translators had all been in the U.S. for several years and were sufficiently bi-cultural to make the adjustments. The ranking procedure and number of items remained the same in the Barna study.

Demographics. Each questionnaire asked student subjects to provide the following demograhic information: whether the school attended was public or private, secondary or college/university, year in school, sex, and any experience studying abroad. These demographic were selected to match those on the Barna study.

Statistical Procedures. All statistics were tabulated using sub programs of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) on a Honey well 6640 computing system at Portland State University. For use in evaluating the completed questionnaires, the subprogram "Frequencies" from the SPSS was used to determine the means, standard deviations, and frequency percentages for each role behavior. "Pearson Corr" (Pearson correlation coefficients) and "Nonpar Corr" (Spearman correlation and Kendall correlation coefficients) subprograms procedures were used to determine the reliability of each item on the questionnaire. The same procedures were used in evaluating data from the Japanese sample.

Reliability study. The subjects selected for the reliability study were from a lower division communication class at Portland State University. It was administered by this researcher initially to 36 students. Two weeks following the first administration, the subjects took the test again. Only 22 of the original 36 were available at the second administration, so the final subject count for the test-retest reliability assessment was 22.

Reliability Limits and Test Results. Since the original form of this questionnaire was developed and then tested by Nadal, it was felt that the same limits would be used as in the Nadal study. Williams (1979) indicates that the most commonly used language for magnitude of

reliability was that offered by Guilford (p.128). The Nadal study also drew on the limits set by Guilford as which follows:

.00 to .20	slight, almost negligible relationship
.20 to .40	low correlation, definite but small relationship
.40 to .70	moderate correlation, substantial relationship
.70 to .90	high correlation, marked relationship
.90 and up	very high correlation, very dependable relationship

As in the Nadal study, any item with a correlation coefficient of .65 or above was retained for hypothesis testing. Those items with a correlation coefficient below .65 were not used in the final data analysis.

Discussion of results: Initially, Pearson Correlation Coefficients were tabulated to determine the reliability of the questionnaire items. On the Student - Role behavior list (referred to as SQ hereafter) those that had a correlation coefficient of .65 and above were numbers: 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, and 19. On the Teacher - Role Behavior list (TQ list), reliable questions were numbers 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 15, 20, 24, and 27. Due to the design of the ranking system on the questionnaire, which is ordinal rather than interval, it was felt that a second statistical procedure was needed since the subprogram Pearson Correlation Coefficient is usually used for interval scales. Spearman Correlation coefficients were chosen from the subprogram "Nonpar Corr" as it is designed for ordinal scales. The two results did not show a large difference (see Table I and II). Since the two statistical procedures did not differ greatly, it was decided that the results from the "Pearson Corr," would be retained for the study.

For comparing the results from the U.S. study to those from the

Japanese, only those items that were reliable in both studies were used. The results from the reliability tests on the Japanese study were different from the U.S. study (see Table III). The items reliable on both studies were: SQ1, SQ4, SQ7, SQ8, SQ10, SQ12, SQ15, SQ18, SQ19, TQ1, TQ2, TQ7, TQ13, TQ20, TQ24, TQ27.

It was somewhat surprising that many items such as TQ3, TQ4, TQ11, TQ12, TQ14, TQ16, TQ17, and TQ22 had been reliable in the Nadal study, but were unreliable in this present study. Many factors could account for this inconsistency of reliablity. It is felt that a possible reason is due to the change from a seven-point scale to a five-point one. This shorter scale has a truncated range which has less discriminating power than the seven-point scale used in the Nadal study. Another possible reason is discussed by Lindman and Merenda (1979), who state, "A test may have high reliability when used with one type of group and low reliability with another type" (p.67). Other factors could have caused the different results of the reliability tests, such as environmental changes, test conditions, subjects attitudes, time of day, etc. They further state that "reliability estimates depend to some extent upon socio-economic level, ethnic and religious background, and a variety of other cultural factors characterizing the samples" (p.67).

Questionnaire Administration

The questionnaire was personally administered to all the students by the researcher in all but the nine questionnires that were received by mail and one class of 14. In the latter case, instructions were discussed with the teacher who administered it prior to the class. Directions were carefully read at each administration. Special notice

was given to the fact that the SQ and TQ lists asked for different kinds of responses, the first being quantitative and the second evaluative. It was also pointed out that the language at times appeared awkward due to the Japanese translation and back translation. For example, item #20 on SQ reads: You do not disturb the class with noise or movement.

All subjects were asked to not write their names to guarantee anonymity. It was made clear that taking the questionnaire was not mandatory. Only two students refused to take it because of parental consent. It took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Observation Checklists

The observation checklist, the instrument used to observe classroom activity, was identical to the one used in the Barna study. Each observation was from 35 to 45 minutes in length. During each observation, the amount of student participation, teacher-student communication, type of questioning, student work setting, student behavior, and classroom climate were all studied. Eight observations were made in Portland area high schools.

TABLE I

RESULTS OF U.S.STUDY RELIABILITY TEST
STUDENT - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #	MEAN X	SD X	MEAN Y	SD Y	PEARSON CORR	SPEARMAN CORR
SQ1	2.91	.97	3.00	.87	.73	.79
SQ2	3.45	.91	3.45	.60	.57	.57
SQ3	3.00	.93	2.73	.77	.47	.39
SQ4	4.36	.58	4.14	.71	.80	.81
SQ5	3.55	.91	3.36	.73	.62	.62
SQ6	4.59	.96	4.36	1.00	.81	.68
SQ7	3.41	1.10	3.32	.84	.83	.84
SQ8	3.45	.86	3.50	.80	.83	.84
SQ9	3.32	.95	3.32	1.04	.47	.50
SQ10	3.32	.89	3.23	1.02	.75	.75
SQ11	3.95	.72	3.77	.69	.36	.34
SQ12	4.45	.91	4.41	.85	.85	.85
SQ13	4.45	.67	4.18	.66	.34	.34
SQ14	3.73	1.12	3.73	1.07	.72	.73
SQ15	1.41	.67	1.59	.67	.71	.73
SQ16	2.00	1.07	2.00	.93	.53	.51
SQ17	4.36	.73	4.27	.55	.45	.55
SQ18	2.73	1.20	2.73	1.16	.76	.70

KEY: X = First administration of questionnaire
Y = Second administration of questionnaire
SD = Standard deviation

(Table I continued on next page)

TABLE I (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #	MEAN X	SD X	MEAN Y	SD Y	PEARSON CORR	SPEARMAN CORR
SQ19	3.41	.91	3.59	.91	.79	.78
SQ20	3.86	1.25	4.14	.94	.63	.65
SQ21	4.36	.79	4.27	.70	.50	.55
SQ22	5.55	1.06	2.50	.91	.54	.61

TABLE II

RESULTS OF U.S. STUDY RELIABILITY TEST
TEACHER - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #	MEAN X	SD X	MEAN Y	SD Y	PEARSON CORR	SPEARMAN CORR
TQ1	4.22	.81	4.27	.70	.72	.77
TQ2	3.22	1.11	3.09	.97	.69	.68
TQ3	4.01	.96	4.45	.60	.58	.47
TQ4	4.55	.60	4.41	.67	.61	.55
TQ5	3.36	1.09	3.32	1.09	.10	.05
TQ6	4.27	.83	4.36	.66	.86	.89
TQ7	4.41	.85	4.41	.73	.71	.65
TQ8	3.68	.89	4.05	.65	.60	.59
TQ9	3.45	.96	3.23	.61	.46	.43
TQ10	3.32	.89	3.18	1.01	.52	.46
TQ11	3.59	1.05	3.91	1.19	.42	.50
TQ12	3.18	1.10	3.09	.87	.53	.49
TQ13	3.32	1.29	3.14	1.13	.66	.63
TQ14	3.36	1.00	3.32	.84	.42	.40
TQ15	3.23	1.23	3.09	.97	.66	.61
TQ16	2.55	.96	2.45	.67	.11	.11
TQ17	2.50	.86	2.68	.84	.56	.50
TQ18	3.41	1.05	3.59	.85	.62	.73

KEY: X = First Administration of questionnaire
Y = Second Administration of questionnaire
SD = Standard Deviation

(Table II continued on the next page)

TABLE II (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #	MEAN X	SD X	MEAN Y	SD Y	PEARSON CORR	SPEARMAN CORR
TQ19	3.73	.98	3.95	.79	.23	.27
TQ20	4.50	.60	4.45	.60	.67	.60
TQ21	3.23	.97	3.14	.99	.56	.48
TQ22	3.23	1.02	3.41	.67	.35	.35
TQ23	3.23	1.27	3.23	1.23	.39	.36
TQ24	4.36	.73	4.45	.67	.82	.79
TQ25	4.27	.88	4.36	.66	.23	.31
TQ26	2.00	1.11	2.00	.87	.64	.70
TQ27	2.95	1.29	3.00	1.07	.69	.64
TQ28	4.55	.67	4.45	.60	.42	.50
TQ29	4.09	.70	4.45	.67	.60	.45

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF RELIABILITY TESTS RESULTS:
U.S. AND JAPANESE STUDY STUDENT - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE	RELIABLE ON U.S. STUDY	RELIABLE ON JAPAN STUDY	RELIABLE ON NEITHER STUDY	RELIABLE ON BOTH STUDIES
SQ1	X	X		X
SQ2		X		
SQ3		X		
SQ4	X	X		X
SQ5			X	
SQ6	X			
SQ7	X	X		X
SQ8	X	X		X
SQ9			X	
SQ10	X	X		X
SQ11		X		
SQ12	X	X		X
SQ13			X	
SQ14	X			
SQ15	X	X		X
SQ16		X		
SQ17		X		
SQ18	X	X		X

(Table III continued on the next page)

TABLE III (Continued)

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE	RELIABLE ON U.S. STUDY	RELIABLE ON JAPAN STUDY	RELIABLE ON NEITHER STUDY	RELIABLE ON BOTH STUDIES
SQ19	X	X		X
SQ20		X		
SQ21		X		
SQ22			X	
TOTALS	11	16	4	9

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF RELIABILITY TESTS RESULTS:
U.S. AND JAPANESE STUDY TEACHER - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE	RELIABLE ON U.S. STUDY	RELIABLE ON JAPAN STUDY	RELIABLE ON NEITHER STUDY	RELIABLE ON BOTH STUDIES
TQ1	X	X		X
TQ2	X	X		X
TQ3		X		
TQ4		X		
TQ5		X		
TQ6	X			
TQ7	X	X		X
TQ8		X		
TQ9			X	
TQ10		X		
TQ11		X		
TQ12		X		
TQ13	X	X		X
TQ14		X		
TQ15	X			
TQ16		X		
TQ17		X		
TQ18		X		

(Table IV continued on the next page)

TABLE IV (continued)

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE	RELIABLE ON U.S. STUDY	RELIABLE ON JAPAN STUDY	RELIABLE ON NEITHER STUDY	RELIABLE ON BOTH STUDIES
TQ19		X		
TQ20	X	X		X
TQ21			X	
TQ22		X		
TQ23		X		
TQ24	X	X		X
TQ25		X		
TQ26		X		
TQ27	X	X		X
TQ28		X		
TQ29		X		
TOTALS	9	25	2	7

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: U.S. STUDY

This chapter will be devoted to reporting and analyzing the results from the U.S. study. In the following chapter, a contrast will be made between the U.S. and Japanese classrooms by comparing the results from both studies. In general, the results of the U.S. study are consistent and supportive of the literature review. It shows that the classroom is interactive, comfortably informal, with students who appreciate an honest and knowledgeable teacher who is open and willing to communicate with them.

In order to conveniently analyze the data, the twenty reliable questions from the U.S. study were divided into categories. First the Student-role-behaviors were separated from the Teacher-role-behaviors. Each group was then sub-divided. The categories for the student-role-behaviors are as follows: "General Student Role Behaviors," "Interaction in the Classroom," and Relationship towards the Teacher." The categories for the teacher-role-behaviors are: "Classroom Management and Teaching Methods," "Relationship Towards the Students," and "Teacher Attributes." Each category will be analyzed in terms of the total population, high school subjects and university subjects. The frequency of how subjects ranked each item as well as the means and standard deviations for each item will be reported and discussed.

TABLE V

RESULTS OF U.S.STUDY: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE	HS MEAN	UNI/COL MEAN	TOTGRP MEAN	HS SD	UNI/COL SD	TOTGRP SD
SQ 1	3.55	3.13	3.32	.84	.91	.90
SQ4	3.97	4.32	4.16	.94	.78	.87
SQ6	3.22	4.15	3.74	.99	1.01	1.10
SQ7	3.89	3.61	3.73	.84	.95	.91
SQ8	3.78	3.62	3.69	.80	.94	.88
SQ10	3.81	3.31	3.53	.90	1.09	1.04
SQ12	4.65	4.24	4.48	.62	1.16	.84
SQ14	4.04	3.45	3.71	.93	1.14	1.09
SQ15	1.94	1.59	1.74	.91	.81	.88
SQ18	2.62	2.92	2.78	1.01	1.20	1.12
SQ19	3.01	3.25	3.16	.94	.93	.92
TQ1	4.22	4.05	4.15	.80	.87	.80
TQ2	3.26	3.11	3.20	1.07	1.10	1.05
TQ6	4.35	4.25	4.33	.71	.97	.77
TQ7	4.40	4.40	4.46	.84	.95	.75
TQ13	3.33	3.19	3.34	1.14	1.24	1.09
TQ15	2.89	3.19	3.08	1.01	1.06	1.01
TQ20	4.49	4.40	4.50	.80	.91	.70
TQ24	4.22	4.24	4.29	1.09	.95	.90
TQ27	2.80	2.61	2.73	1.23	1.24	1.21

KEY: HS = High School students
UNI/COL = University and College students
TOTGRP = Total group
SD = Standard Deviation

STUDENT - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

A. General Student-Role-Behaviors

Items that fell in to the general student role behavior category were SQ4, SQ6, SQ12, SQ18, and SQ19. These items relate to behaviors students do and are expected to do in the classroom. They are the ones that are general and describe the importance of personal appearance, homework appearance, and habits such as taking notes for future study and competing with others in the classroom.

SQ4: Do you make homework neat and legible?

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY FOR SQ4: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	0.9	1.9	0.0
2.RARELY	*	2.6	4.8	0.8
3.SOMETIMES	*	17.9	19.2	16.9
4.OFTEN	*	36.8	42.3	32.3
5.ALWAYS	*	41.9	31.7	50.0
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ6: Do you take notes in class for future study?

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ6: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	3.4	4.8	2.3
2.RARELY	*	10.7	17.3	5.4
3.SOMETIMES	*	23.9	36.5	13.8

(continued on the next page)

4.OFTEN	*	32.5	33.7	31.5
5.ALWAYS	*	29.5	7.7	46.9
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ12: Do you maintain proper personal grooming and the dress code?

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ12: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	1.3	0.0	2.3
2.RARELY	*	2.1	1.0	3.1
3.SOMETIMES	*	8.5	4.8	11.5
4.OFTEN	*	22.6	22.1	23.1
5.ALWAYS	*	64.1	72.1	57.7
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	0.0	2.3
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ18: Do you want to know the scores and grades of other students in the class?

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY FOR SQ18: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	14.1	14.4	13.8
2.RARELY	*	25.6	29.8	22.3
3.SOMETIMES	*	36.3	39.4	33.8
4.OFTEN	*	15.8	12.5	18.5
5.ALWAYS	*	8.1	3.8	11.5
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ19: Do you have good sitting posture?

(see Table X on the next page)

TABLE X

FREQUENCY FOR SQ19: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	3.0	3.8	2.3
2.RARELY	*	18.4	24.0	13.8
3.SOMETIMES	*	46.2	47.1	45.4
4.OFTEN	*	23.9	17.3	29.2
5.ALWAYS	*	8.1	7.7	8.5
NO RESPONSE	*	0.4	0.0	0.8
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. The results of the General Student-Role-Behavior category are supportive of the literature reviewed. SQ4's (see Table VI) response indicates that students are concerned with the appearance of their work. This was outlined earlier as one of the ideal student role behaviors in that a student should work carefully and successfully on assignments. Students also indicate that their personal appearance is important in SQ12 (see Table VIII); yet this specific question is arbitrary and difficult to interpret since no special dress code is stated, and one person's "proper personal grooming" might be different from another. Surprisingly, the frequency of behavior is quite low in SQ19 (see Table X) which asked about the students posture. In a sense, this is contradictory to SQ12 and SQ4. Students seem to be concerned with the appearance of their work and of themselves, yet their posture in class is of less consideration. Note that 64.1% of the total group indicate that they "always" maintain proper personal grooming... and 8.1% "always" have good sitting posture. Perhaps this is due to the informality accepted in the U.S. classroom. In a personal observation

made in several classes, this researcher noted that some students who sat in the back of the room leaned against the wall, some students were slumped over as if they were sleeping, others stretched their legs out, while still others sat straight in the chairs. The observation results were as varied as the responses to SQ19.

In general, responses to SQ18 (see Table IX) indicate that students are not necessarily competitive with other classmates in terms of wanting to know the score and grades of others. This may reflect the value of individualism in that a student may compete against him/herself rather than other classmates. The range of percentages is quite varied; yet most of the responses are between "sometimes" and "rarely" for the total population. The university/college (UNI/COLL) students show more variance in responses than high schools (HS) students; and a higher frequency of UNI/COLL students (11% verses 3.8% for HS) "always" want to know the scores and grades of others. With the range of responses so varied, one can assume that it is a personal choice. This behavior appears important to some and not to others.

The response to SQ6 (see Table VII) indicates that UNI/COLL students take notes for future study far more often than HS students. 46.9% of UNI/COLL respond "always" to SQ6 compared to 7.7% of HS students. This may indicate the different kind of classes and teaching practices between the two levels of education.

B. Interaction and Participation in the Classroom

Items SQ1, SQ7, and SQ8 fell into this category. Responses to these three items were very consistent with the literature in that students do participate in classroom activities. They clearly support

the notion that students are not passive, but rather active contributors to the classroom process.

SQ1: Do you volunteer questions without hesitation?

TABLE XI

FREQUENCY FOR SQ1: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	1.7	0.0	3.1
2.RARELY	*	15.4	8.7	20.8
3.SOMETIMES	*	41.5	41.3	41.5
4.OFTEN	*	32.5	36.5	29.2
5.ALWAYS	*	9.0	13.5	5.4
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ7: Do you participate in class discussion, share ideas and express your opinion?

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ7: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	0.4	0.0	0.8
2.RARELY	*	8.5	4.8	11.5
3.SOMETIMES	*	30.3	26.9	33.1
4.OFTEN	*	38.9	43.3	35.4
5.ALWAYS	*	21.8	25.0	19.2
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ8: Do you think and speak quickly when called on by the teacher?

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ8: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	1.3	0.0	2.3
2.RARELY	*	6.8	4.8	8.5
3.SOMETIMES	*	30.8	30.8	30.8
4.OFTEN	*	44.0	46.2	42.3
5.ALWAYS	*	17.1	18.3	16.2
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. The above three tables show the results of items that were written with the assumption that students actively participate in the classroom. SQ1 (see Table XI) indicates that students do volunteer questions without hesitation more often in HS than the UNI/COLL. Note that the frequencies for UNI/COLL students are mostly between "rarely" and "often" and HS frequencies are distributed between "sometimes and "often." The responses to SQ7 (see Table XII) show that most students either sometimes, often or always participate in class discussion. Again, HS students indicate a higher frequency of interaction. The results from SQ1 and SQ7 indicate that nature of the classroom in the UNI/COLL and HS are different. HS students appear to interact more often in the classroom than UNI/COLL students.

The responses to SQ8 (see Table XIII) indicates that most HS and UNI/COLL students either sometimes, often or always think quickly when called upon. These responses are consistent with the literature reviewed in that silence is avoided in the classroom; and a student is expected to pay attention during a lesson. If a student hesitates for a long time, he/she and others will become nervous. The student also does

not want to appear as if he/she is not paying attention or following the lesson so he/she tries to think quickly and give an answer. Otherwise, a long wait could cause possible embarrassment for the student.

C. Relationship Towards the Teacher.

Items for this category are SQ10, SQ14, and SQ15. These three items relate to the relationship between the student and teacher. The results are consistent with the literature reviewed.

SQ10 Do you show respect to the teacher in some way when entering or leaving the class? (For example: saying hello or good-bye to the teacher)

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY FOR SQ10: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	1.3	0.0	2.3
2.RARELY	*	17.9	9.6	24.6
3.SOMETIMES	*	26.9	23.1	30.0
4.OFTEN	*	34.2	44.2	26.2
5.ALWAYS	*	19.7	23.1	16.9
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ14: Do you go to the teacher to find out what happened in class when you have been absent?

TABLE XV

FREQUENCY FOR SQ14: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	3.4	7.7	6.2
2.RARELY	*	11.1	18.3	13.8

(continued on the next page)

3.SOMETIMES	*	24.4	36.5	29.2
4.OFTEN	*	33.3	36.5	30.8
5.ALWAYS	*	27.8	37.5	20.0
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ15: Do you ever go to the teacher's office without an obvious reason?

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY FOR SQ15: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.NEVER	*	48.7	37.5	57.7
2.RARELY	*	31.6	33.7	30.0
3.SOMETIMES	*	15.8	24.0	9.2
4.OFTEN	*	2.6	2.9	2.3
5.ALWAYS	*	0.9	1.0	0.8
NO RESPONSE	*	0.4	1.0	0.0
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. The responses to SQ10 (see Table XIV) are quite varied indicating that it is a personal choice to greet or say good-bye to the teacher. HS students indicate they do this behavior more frequently (44.2% responding "often") than UNI/COLL students (26.2% responding "often"). This could be due to the nature of the class. Some HS students have the same teacher for a year whereas UNI/COLL students and teachers usually have only one term together.

The response to SQ14 (see Table XV) futher supports the indication that HS students more frequently communicate with their teachers. A combined percentage of "often" and "always" indicates 74.0% HS and 50.0% for UNI/COLL go to the teacher to find out what happened if class was

missed. It could also indicate that the student is interested in the course content and it is important to stay informed about the classroom activities. Even though students feel that they can communicate with a teacher, they do only when they have a reason to. SQ15 (see Table XVI) points out that 57.7% of the UNI/COLL students and 37.5% of the HS students "never" go to the teachers office without reason. Again, HS students report a higher frequency of this behavior than UNI/COLL students.

In summary, the student-role-behaviors that have been analyzed generally had wide variations in responses. This could indicate the value of individualism and that there are not many strict rules pertaining to these behaviors. HS students indicate a higher frequency of interaction in the classroom and communication with the teacher than UNI/COLL students. The results support the literature reviewed in that the classroom at both levels of education (HS and UNI/COLL) is an interactive environment in which students feel that they can approach a teacher.

TEACHER - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

A. Classroom Management and Teaching Methods

Items selected for this category are: TQ2, TQ15, and TQ27. Unfortunately, many of the items that would have fit in this category were unreliable, thus, these three seem few in number and in some ways unrelated. However, they all do deal with managing time in the classroom and maintain the flow of instruction. As a reminder, it is important to note that these responses are different from the student-role-behaviors.

feel about the described behavior not whether these behaviors occur or not.

TQ2: Will permit students to take over and direct the class at times.

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY FOR TQ2: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	6.4	5.8	6.9
2.POOR	*	17.5	16.3	18.5
3.FAIR	*	34.6	37.5	32.3
4.GOOD	*	30.8	26.9	33.8
5.VERY GOOD	*	9.8	13.5	6.9
NO RESPONSE	*	0.9	0.0	1.5
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ15: Calls on students only when they volunteer

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY FOR TQ15: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	5.6	6.7	4.6
2.POOR	*	22.2	30.8	15.4
3.FAIR	*	37.6	35.6	39.2
4.GOOD	*	26.1	21.2	30.0
5.VERY GOOD	*	7.7	5.8	9.2
NO RESPONSE	*	0.9	0.0	1.5
TOTAL %		100.00	100.0	100.0

TQ17: Will wait as long as one or two minutes for a student to think of an answer to a question.

(see Table XIX on the next page)

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY FOR TQ17: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	18.8	16.3	20.8
2.POOR	*	23.9	23.1	24.6
3.FAIR	*	29.9	30.8	29.2
4.GOOD	*	17.5	19.2	16.2
5.VERY GOOD	*	8.5	9.6	7.7
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	1.0	1.5
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. The responses to TQ2 (see Table XVII) indicate that the majority of students feel that allowing the students to direct the class at times is "fair" to "good behavior". It is also an indicator that students accept the idea of the teacher taking a secondary role in the classroom at times. HS and UNI/COLL responses are nearly the same. TQ15 received mixed responses. For the total population, the frequency of response is mostly between "poor" and "good." Although the distribution of responses is similar between the HS and UNI/COll students, 30.8% of HS indicate this is "poor" behavior compared to 15.4% of UNI/-COLL students. This again shows the HS student's willingness to volunteer and interact in the classroom.

TQ27 (see Table XIX) has a wide range of responses from "very poor" to "good." However, most of the responses are between "fair" and "very poor" indicating that students do not like it when a teacher waits as long as one or two minutes for a response. Note, that 53.8% of the total group responded between "fair" and "poor." The frequency of responses is similar for both the HS and UNI/COLL student. Students may

feel uncomfortable with the silence and feel embarrassment while a teacher waits for a long time for a response. Both TQ27 and SQ8 reflect the uneasiness one has with silence in the U.S..

B. Relationship Towards Student.

Items chosen for this category are: TQ1, TQ13, and TQ20. Similar to the Student-Role-Behavior category, these three items deal with the relationship between the teacher and student; and specifically look at how teacher treat students.

TQ1: Treats students as if they were and equal: acts as a friend as well as a teacher

TABLE XX

FREQUENCY FOR TQ1: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	0.4	0.0	0.8
2.POOR	*	0.9	1.9	0.0
3.FAIR	*	20.1	17.3	22.3
4.GOOD	*	40.6	37.5	43.1
5.VERY GOOD	*	37.6	43.3	33.1
NO RESPONSE	*	0.4	0.0	0.8
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ13: Gives students with special problems a lot of extra attention (i.e. students with physical or mental disabilities)

(see Table XXI on the next page)

TABLE XXI

FREQUENCY FOR TQ13: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	4.7	4.8	4.6
2.POOR	*	16.2	16.3	16.2
3.FAIR	*	34.2	33.7	34.6
4.GOOD	*	26.1	26.9	25.4
5.VERY GOOD	*	16.2	17.3	15.4
NO RESPONSE	*	2.6	1.0	3.8
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ20: Shows willingness to talk to students at any time— before or after class, in the office, or outside school

TABLE XXII

FREQUENCY FOR TQ20: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	0.0	0.0	0.0
2.POOR	*	1.7	1.9	1.5
3.FAIR	*	6.8	3.8	9.2
4.GOOD	*	30.8	32.7	29.2
5.VERY GOOD	*	59.4	60.6	58.5
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	1.0	1.5
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. In general, responses indicate that students appreciate an open teacher who is willing to talk with them and treat them as an equal—an important U.S. value previously discussed. TQ1's (see Table XX) response strongly shows the value of equality. HS students with a combined percentage of 80.8% and UNI/COLL students with 76.2% feel that is a "good" or "very good behavior" for a teacher to treat a

student as if he/she were an equal. Equality is again an issue in TQ13 (see Table XXI) where subjects appear to have some mixed feelings about treating a student with a special problem differently from others. HS and UNI/COLL subjects are nearly identical in their responses. Responses ranged from 16.2% for "poor" behavior to 16.2% for "very good behavior" for the total population. There are clearly two factions here--a struggle between "everyone should be treated the same," as equals, and "the disabled student should receive more help."

Both HS and UNI/COLL students feel about the same towards TQ20 (see Table XXII) when they strongly indicate that a teacher's willingness to talk to them at any time is "very good behavior" (60.6% for HS and 58.5% for UNI/COLL). As the literature shows, an effective teacher is genuinely interested in the student; and by these responses, students indicate that this behavior is well appreciated. This also shows the value of equality in that students like a teacher who is approachable and willing to communicate with them rather than distant and aloof.

C. Teacher Attributes

Item numbers TQ6, TQ7, and TQ24 were selected for this category since thay all relate to special characteristics a teacher may have.

TQ6: Answers any question that is asked in class about the subject matter

(see Table XXIII on the next page)

TABLE XXIII

FREQUENCY FOR TQ6: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	0.0	0.0	0.0
2.POOR	*	1.3	0.0	2.3
3.FAIR	*	14.1	13.5	14.6
4.GOOD	*	34.6	38.5	31.5
5.VERY GOOD	*	49.1	48.1	50.0
NO RESPONSE	*	0.9	0.0	1.5
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ7: If shown to be mistaken, is willing to admit it

TABLE XXIV

FREQUENCY FOR TQ7: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	0.9	1.9	0.0
2.POOR	*	0.9	1.0	0.8
3.FAIR	*	7.7	8.7	6.9
4.GOOD	*	32.1	31.7	32.3
5.VERY GOOD	*	57.3	56.7	57.7
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	0.0	2.3
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ24: Adds humor to his/her lectures

(see Table XXV on the next page)

TABLE XXV

FREQUENCY FOR TQ24: U.S. STUDY

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)	HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)	UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)
1.VERY POOR	*	2.1	3.8	0.8
2.POOR	*	3.0	3.8	2.3
3.FAIR	*	8.1	5.8	10.0
4.GOOD	*	36.8	34.6	38.5
5.VERY GOOD	*	48.7	51.0	46.9
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	1.0	1.5
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. All three behaviors in the above category are well-liked by the majority of students in both the high school and college. Consistent with the literature review, the teacher is expected to be very knowledgeable in the subject matter. Being able to answer any question asked is regarded "good" or "very good behavior" (83.7% combined percentages for the total group). The literature also points out that an effective teacher makes a lesson interesting; and one way is through humor. The subjects strongly indicate that humor (see Table XXV) is considered a "good" or "very good behavior" (85.5% combined percentages for the total group). Responses to TQ7 (see Table XXIV) indicate that students appreciate an honest teacher who will admit a mistake. This characteristic allows students to regard the teacher as more "human" and as more of an equal. It narrows the gap of teacher superiority and student inferiority which was discussed earlier as an important aspect of today's U.S. classroom.

Conclusion

The results from the U.S. study are consistent and supportive of the literature reviewed. The presumptions that the student participates in the classroom as well as volunteers questions and at times directs the class were all supported in the study's results. During the data analysis, it was interesting to discover the several differences between HS and UNI/COLL students. These differences had not been anticipated. The HS student is more interactive in the classroom than UNI/COLL students and the student/teacher relationship in general is more communicative in high school than in college.

The U.S. values of individualism, equality, and honesty were especially noted. The varied responses to some of the items indicate that it is of individual choice rather than of a previously set rule--i.e. greeting the teacher. Students strongly indicate that being treated as an equal by the teacher is very good behavior. Even though the teacher should be an "expert" in the subject matter by answering any question asked, the students appreciate the honest teacher who can admit his/her mistakes. HS and UNI/COll responses had fewer descrepencies in Teacher-Role-Behavior categories. This could indicate that even though certain student role behaviors change from HS to UNI/COLL, most expectations of the teacher's behavior remains the same.

Results of Observation Checklists

The results of the observation checklists (see appendix) provided information gathered directly from the classroom. Only five public high school classes were observed. Classes observed were: Social Studies, Latin, German, Spanish and Personal Finance. Even though the

observations were informally done and subjective, the results are interesting and add a further dimension to the study.

The average time for class observation was 35-45 minutes. During which the average student participation time was 10 minutes and 15 seconds. For "teacher-student communication," the average teacher communication was 20 minutes. The rest of the time was spent on other activities. For the "type of questions" asked by students of teachers and teacher of students, the average number per class was: 7 from students regarding instructions; 11 from students regarding material presented in the class; 9 from the teacher asking for correct answers; and 2 from the teacher requiring original thinking. For the "Student Work Setting", the majority of the time was spent with the students facing the teacher. However, students gave oral reports, worked in small groups, and individually on journals during other parts of the class time. Most students appeared attentive during the first part of the class period and during the last 5 to 10 minutes most were off task--either talking, packing up books, sleeping, etc. The classroom climate was on the average relaxed, informal and somewhat controlled by the teacher. These judgements, made by this researcher, were based on how the students were seated, how they interacted with one another, if they talked during the time the teacher was talking and if the teacher had to remind the class the be quiet. On three scales from 7 to 1, 7 = tense, formal and controlled and 1 = relaxed, informal and uncontrolled, the means were 3.4, 2.6, and 4.8 respectively. It is not claimed that these classroom observations results are statistically reliable; they were used only to provide a general idea of the U.S. classroom in session.

A contrast was made between the U.S. and Japanese classroom role behaviors using the questionnaires and informal observation checklists. The results of this contrast will be reported in Chapter V. It is expected that differences will be found that demonstrate the culturally learned nature of one's classroom role behaviors.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS: U.S. AND JAPANESE STUDIES COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

The comparison between the U.S. and Japanese studies was done in a similar format to the analysis of the U.S. results. Sixteen items that proved reliable in both studies were divided into the same categories as in Chapter IV. The population from the Japanese study had a total of 1382 student participants: 1022 from high schools and 360 from the university. Information pertaining to Japanese cultural values and behaviors was taken directly from the Barna study (1986) and a personal interview conducted by this researcher.

STUDENT - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

A. General Student Role Behaviors

The items chosen for this category are SQ4, SQ12, SQ18, and SQ19.

SQ4: Do you make homework neat and legible?

TABLE XXVI

FREQUENCY FOR SQ4: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	0.9	4.7	1.9	5.1	0.0	3.6
2.RARELY	*	2.6	8.8	4.8	8.7	0.8	9.2
3.SOMETIMES	*	17.9	24.0	19.2	26.2	16.9	17.5
4.OFTEN	*	36.8	34.0	42.3	35.8	32.3	28.9
5.ALWAYS	*	41.9	28.1	31.7	23.7	50.0	40.8
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ12: Do you maintain proper personal grooming and the dress code?

TABLE XXVII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ12: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	1.3	9.5	0.0	2.2	2.3	30.3
2.RARELY	*	2.1	4.5	1.0	3.8	3.1	6.4
3.SOMETIMES	*	8.5	16.4	4.8	17.4	11.5	13.6
4.OFTEN	*	22.6	19.8	22.1	22.5	23.1	11.9
5.ALWAYS	*	64.1	47.8	72.1	54.0	57.7	30.0
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	2.1	0.0	0.1	2.3	7.8
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ18: Do you want to know the scores and grades of other students in the class?

TABLE XXVIII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ18: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	14.1	11.6	14.4	8.1	13.8	21.7
2.RARELY	*	25.6	15.6	29.8	14.6	22.3	18.3
3.SOMETIMES	*	36.3	36.2	39.4	38.5	33.8	29.7
4.OFTEN	*	15.8	22.7	12.5	23.7	18.5	20.0
5.ALWAYS	*	8.1	13.9	3.8	15.2	11.5	10.3
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ19: Do you have good sitting posture?

(see Table XXIX on the next page)

TABLE XXIX

FREQUENCY FOR SQ19: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	3.0	6.9	3.8	5.0	2.3	12.5
2.RARELY	*	18.4	19.0	24.0	16.9	13.8	24.7
3.SOMETIMES	*	46.2	42.8	47.1	45.6	45.4	34.7
4.OFTEN	*	23.9	24.0	17.3	25.0	29.2	21.4
5.ALWAYS	*	8.1	7.2	7.7	7.4	8.5	6.7
NO RESPONSE	*	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.8	0.0
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. The major difference noted between schools in the U.S. and in Japan in the general student-role-behaviors category concerns the difference betweeen behaviors in the Japanese high school (HS) and university (UNI). According to Barna (1986), the Japanese HS's are highly competitive and a lot stricter than the UNI. Once a student enters the UNI he/she can virtually relax. In other words, the requirement of a uniform, a daily greeting to the teacher, the serious competitiveness to pass the entrance exams to the UNI, etc. are gone. In a sense, getting to the UNI takes more work than being there. This difference between the Japanese HS and UNI is especially noted in SQ12, SQ18, and SQ19. (see Tables XXVII, XXVIII, and XXIX). SQ18 reflects the competitive nature of the Japanese HS in that more students want to know the grades and scores of others than in the Japanese UNI. For example, 21.7% of UNI students indicate they "never" want to know compared to only 8.1% of HS students. Japanese HS also indicate a higher frequency than U.S. HS students. A combined percentage of 77.4% of Japanese HS shows that they "sometimes," "often," or "always," want to

know the grades and scores of others. U.S. students, with a combined percentage of 83.6% say they "sometimes," "rarely," or "never" do.

According to Barna (1986) the dress code is strictly enforced in the Japanese HS and most schools require a uniform. By the time students reach the university they look forward to more relaxed rules. In the U.S. however, in the schools studied, there is no uniform required. Dressing for school is nearly the same for both HS and UNI/COLL students. There is a 27.7% drop from Japanese HS to UNI students who "always" maintain the dress code.

In Table XXIX, Japanese HS students indicate that they have good sitting posture more often than UNI students: 30.3% of UNI students say they "never" have good posture compared to 2.2% of HS students who indicate they "never" do. The frequency of good sitting posture increases in the U.S. between HS and the UNI/COLL and decreases in Japan.

Table XXVI indicates that making homework neat and legible is perhaps less mandatory yet still important in Japan as compared to the U.S.. Note that 28.1% of the total population in Japan "always" make their homework neat and 41.9% of the U.S. total population studied do. However, the total mean for SQ4 in the Japanese study is 3.71 (see Table XLII) indicating that this behavior is important in the Japanese classroom. Barna reports that is not only shows care and respect but the attention to detail that is so prevalent in Japan. She also reports that there is more homework assigned in the U.S. than in Japan which might account for the lower concern with neatness in Japan. The emphasis is on memorization of factual data rather than creative themes or research reports.

It is relevant to note the Japanese value of the hierarchial relationship. The Japanese anthropologist, Chie Nakane (1970), labeled Japan "the vertical society." Examples of this can be found everywhere in Japan; seniors and juniors never stand on the same footing. This not only includes age difference but the date someone entered a school or a business. Nakane (1970) states that "Most Japanese, whatever their status or occupation, are involved in oyabun-kobun relationships" (p.43). The oyabun plays the role of a father, assisting and supporting the subordinate the kobun. In the case of a professor (oyabun) and his/her student (kobun) the relationship is likely to be lifelong, with the student still asking for advice and support and giving gifts and admiration in return. In the vertical relationship, the person of lower status bears much of the responsibility in maintaining and insuring the harmonious balance between the upper and lower individual. This means that students are careful to be dutiful and to show signs of attention and respect. Items SQ4, SQ12, and SQ19 (Tables XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX) which have been discussed above; and SQ8, SQ10, and SQ15 (Tables XXXII, XXXIII, and XXXIV) which will be discussed, are all somewhat related to a student's willingness to submit to authority and to do whatever is needed to maintain the good will of the person on whom he/she is dependent.

B. Interaction and Participation in the Classroom

Items SQ1, SQ7 and SQ8 are in the following category.

SQ1: Do you volunteer questions without hesitation?

(see Table XXX on the next page)

TABLE XXX

FREQUENCY FOR SQ1: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	1.7	23.4	0.0	18.8	3.1	36.4
2.RARELY	*	15.4	39.0	8.7	38.7	20.8	39.7
3.SOMETIMES	*	41.5	25.3	41.3	27.9	41.5	17.8
4.OFTEN	*	32.5	7.5	36.5	8.5	29.2	4.7
5.ALWAYS	*	9.0	4.4	13.5	5.6	5.4	1.1
NO RESPONSE	*		0.4		0.5		0.3
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ7: Do you participate in class discussion, share ideas and express your opinion?

TABLE XXXI

FREQUENCY FOR SQ7: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	0.4	32.6	0.0	30.7	0.8	37.8
2.RARELY	*	8.5	39.0	4.8	39.0	11.5	38.9
3.SOMETIMES	*	30.3	18.9	26.9	19.3	33.1	17.8
4.OFTEN	*	38.9	5.7	43.3	6.3	35.4	4.2
5.ALWAYS	*	21.8	3.8	25.0	4.7	19.2	1.4
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ8: Do you think and speak quickly when called on by the teacher.

(see Table XXXII on the next page)

TABLE XXXII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ8: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	1.3	1.4	0.0	1.3	2.3	1.7
2.RARELY	*	6.8	7.3	4.8	7.5	8.5	6.7
3.SOMETIMES	*	30.8	29.4	30.8	31.2	30.8	24.2
4.OFTEN	*	44.0	36.6	46.2	37.7	42.3	33.6
5.ALWAYS	*	17.1	25.2	18.3	22.1	16.2	33.9
NO RESPONSE	*		0.1		0.2		
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. A large difference is noted between the U.S. and Japan in terms of classroom interaction and student participation. The values of individualism and groupism are reflected in the choices the subjects have made. For SQ1 (see Table XXX), a combined percentage of 83.6% indicates that the total U.S. group "sometimes," "often," or "always" volunteer without hesitation. This is compared to a combined percentage of 87.7% of the total Japanese group who "sometimes," "rarely," or "never" do. The response to SQ7 (see Table XXXI) yields similiar results: 0.4% of the the total U.S. subjects compares to 32.6% of the Japanese who indicate they "never" participate in classroom discussion. Both SQ1 and SQ7 exemplify the Japanese value of the "group." The often quoted Japanese saying is Deru kugi wa utareru, "The nail that sticks up is hit down" (Cathcart and Cathcart, 1982, p.120). In Japanese society, groups "are the 'natural' or normal milieu in which human interaction takes place" (p.121). The American view of the group considers the individual as part of a group where in Japan, the concept of indivudal identity is "submerged" and one is perceivied as an integral part of the whole (p.121). Richard Halloran (1972) in his book JAPAN: Images and

Realities, titles a chapter "We Japanese," exemplifying how seldom Japanese even think in terms of "I"— a word that is notably capitalized in English. According to Barna, decision-making is by group concenses. Even the idea of being individually presented with a questionnaire was foreign to the Japanese subjects in her study. They are not used to making individual choices and would have much preferred to have conferred with their friends. Barna (1986) notes that it was obvious when looking at the returns from a few classes that some of the students had managed to confer and come to the decision as to how is that "We" Japanese interact in a classroom.

According to Barna, the atmosphere in the Japanese classroom is far more formal and authoritative than in the U.S. The classroom usually has a lecture format and students are expected to listen and remain quiet, speaking only when asked a specific question by the teacher. The responses to SQ8 are similar between the two studies a total mean of 3.69 in the U.S. and 3.77 in Japan. However, the Japanese indicate that more students "always" answer quickly when called upon (25.2% of the total Japanese group compared to 17.1% of the total U.S. group). This could be due to the seriousness of the class. Since most questions require a correct response, a student is expected to be able to answer quickly and accurately. Barna notes that in a few HS classes she observed, students who answered incorrectly were asked to remain standing for the duration of the period. This supposedly made their "shame" more noticeable and would encourage them to study harder in the future.

It is also expected of the student to say "Hi" a word similar to "yes" and meaning "I'm listening and thinking," immediately after being

called upon. Barna reports that the attitude towards "quickness" is an aspect of everyday life in Japan. People move fast and walk fast. Businessmen reach around and will push the elevator door "shut" button before they even enter the elevator. Housewives actually run while dusting their houses. She was not surprised with the response to SQ8. She also notes that this response also indicates respect to the teacher.

C. Relationship Towards the Teacher

Items SQ10 and SQ15 make up this category.

SQ10 Do you show respect to the teacher in some way when entering or leaving the class? (For example: saying hello or good-bye to the teacher)

TABLE XXXIII

FREQUENCY FOR SQ10: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	1.3	4.3	0.0	1.8	2.3	11.7
2.RARELY	*	17.9	10.2	9.6	3.8	24.6	28.3
3.SOMETIMES	*	26.9	16.7	23.1	13.0	30.0	27.2
4.OFTEN	*	34.2	15.6	44.2	13.9	26.2	20.3
5.ALWAYS	*	19.7	53.0	23.1	67.3	16.9	12.2
NO RESPONSE	*		0.2		0.2		0.3
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SQ15: Do you ever go to the teacher's office without an obvious reason?

(see Table XXXIV on the next page)

TABLE XXXIV

FREQUENCY FOR SQ15: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.NEVER	*	48.7	53.9	37.5	53.3	57.7	55.6
2.RARELY	*	31.6	22.6	33.7	22.7	30.0	22.5
3.SOMETIMES	*	15.8	12.7	24.0	13.8	9.2	9.7
4.OFTEN	*	2.6	6.8	2.9	6.0	2.3	9.2
5.ALWAYS	*	0.9	3.5	1.0	4.1	0.8	4.1
NO RESPONSE	*	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.1	0.0	1.1
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. SQ10 is a further indication that the Japanese HS is different from the Japanese UNI. Note that 67.3% of HS students "always" greet the teacher compared to 12.2% of UNI students. Barna contends that this is due to the ritualized greeting HS students go through every morning when the teacher enters the class. The somewhat more relaxed atmosphere of the UNI classroom foregoes this ritual. The greeting in the U.S. classroom is of personal choice rather than a mandate. The opposite is true in the Japanese HS. Note that 19.7% of the total U.S. group "always" greet the teacher and 53.0% of total Japanese group say they "always" do. The teacher in the Japanese class is an authoritative figure; the greeting is one way to show respect to the teacher and maintain that ever important "vertical" relationship.

The response to SQ15 (see Table XXXIV) is similar between the two studies. However, according to Barna, the Japanese student is extremely hesitant to go to a teacher even if they need something. The relationship between the Japanese teacher and his/her students is more distant and formal than in the U.S.

In summary, the Japanese student-role-behaviors differ from those in the U.S in several aspects. There is a greater distinction between the HS and UNI student in Japan than in the U.S. The Japanese HS is more competitive in nature and more formal than the Japanese UNI, U.S. HS, and U.S. UNI/COLL in terms of wanting to know the scores and grades of others in the class. The Japanese do not interact in the classroom with each other or with the teacher as is encouraged in the U.S.. There are more ritualized behaviors expected from students in Japan especially in the HS. In both the Japanese HS and UNI, the teacher and student relationship is not as "open" and communicative as in the U.S.. Japan is rule-oriented and students communicate according to prescribed patterns. The prevailing values of groupism and hierarchial relationships in Japanese society are clearly reflected in the behaviors of the students which clearly differ from the behaviors of U.S. students whose predominate values of individualism and equality dictate much of their behavior.

TEACHER - ROLE - BEHAVIORS

A. Classroom Management and Teaching Methods

TQ2 and TQ27 are in the following category. As a reminder, it is important to note here that the responses to teacher-role-behaviors are different from the student-role-behaviors. The subjects are asked to judge how they feel about a certain behavior rather than how often this behavior occurs.

TQ2: Will permit students to take over and direct the class at times.

(see Table XXXV on the next page)

TABLE XXXV

FREQUENCY FOR TQ2: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR	*	6.4	4.2	5.8	3.4	6.9	6.4
2.POOR	*	17.5	12.2	16.3	13.4	18.5	8.9
3.FAIR	*	34.6	38.4	37.5	39.9	32.3	33.9
4.GOOD	*	30.8	28.7	26.9	29.3	33.8	27.2
5.VERY GOOD	*	9.8	11.3	13.5	11.9	6.9	9.4
NO RESPONSE	*	0.9	5.2	0.0	2.1	1.5	14.2
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ17: Will wait as long as one or two minutes for a student to think of an answer to a question

TABLE XXXVI

FREQUENCY FOR TQ17: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR	*	18.8	5.1	16.3	4.9	20.8	5.8
2.POOR	*	23.9	12.0	23.1	11.7	24.6	12.8
3.FAIR	*	29.9	38.5	30.8	39.4	29.2	35.8
4.GOOD	*	17.5	27.3	19.2	29.1	16.2	22.2
5.VERY GOOD	*	8.5	11.8	9.6	12.8	7.7	8.9
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	5.3	1.0	2.1	1.5	14.4
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. Surprisingly, there is little difference between the U.S. and Japan in response to TQ2 (see Table XXXV). The range of responses is as varied in the Japanese study as in the U.S.—mostly between "fair" and "good." According to Barna, students are not normally allowed to take over and direct the class, however, they indicate that they like this behavior. Barna notes that it would have been

valuable information to know what the Japanese students were thinking when they read TQ2.

Silence is tolerated more in Japan than in the U.S.. This is indicated in TQ27 where students feel more positive about a teacher waiting as long as one or two minutes for a student to think of an answer. A combined percentage of 77.6% of the total Japanese group and 55.9% of the total U.S. group indicates they feel this is "fair" to "very good" behavior. According to Barna, the Japanese may answer and act quickly as indicated in SQ8, but once they have indicated to the teacher that they are listening and attentive, they appreciate enough time to prepare their thoughts so they will have an accurate response. This behavior is quite different from the U.S. uneasiness of prolonged silence. As indicated in the literature review, a U.S. teacher may be so impatient with a student that he/she will answer the question before the student can. In Japan, the silence between the words is as or more important than the words themselves.

B. Relationship Towards Student

Items TQ1, TQ13, and TQ20 make up the following category.

TQ1: Treats students as if they were and equal: acts as a friend as well as a teacher

TABLE XXXVII

FREQUENCY FOR TQ1: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE	TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR *	0.4	3.1	0.0	3.3	0.8	2.5
2.POOR *	0.9	9.6	1.9	1.4	0.0	7.2
3.FAIR *	20.1	28.8	17.3	30.8	22.3	23.1

(continued on the next page)

4.GOOD	*	40.6	29.6	37.5	30.8	43.1	26.1
5.VERY GOOD	*	37.6	23.7	43.3	22.5	33.1	26.9
NO RESPONSE	*	0.4	5.3	0.0	2.2	0.8	14.2
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ13: Gives students with special problems a lot of extra attention (i.e. students with physical or mental disabilities)

TABLE XXXVIII

FREQUENCY FOR TQ13: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR	*	4.7	4.8	4.8	5.5	4.6	3.1
2.POOR	*	16.2	10.7	16.3	11.0	16.2	10.0
3.FAIR	*	34.2	41.5	33.7	42.4	34.6	38.9
4.GOOD	*	26.1	22.4	26.9	23.7	25.4	18.6
5.VERY GOOD	*	16.2	14.4	17.3	23.7	15.4	15.3
NO RESPONSE	*	2.6	6.2	1.0	3.4	3.8	14.2
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ20: Shows willingness to talk to students at any time-- before or after class, in the office, or outside school

TABLE XXXIX

FREQUENCY FOR TQ20: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR	*	0.0	2.5	0.0	2.7	0.0	1.9
2.POOR	*	1.7	4.6	1.9	4.5	1.5	5.0
3.FAIR	*	6.8	18.2	3.8	19.9	9.2	13.3
4.GOOD	*	30.8	28.7	32.7	30.5	29.2	23.6
5.VERY GOOD	*	59.4	40.7	60.6	40.2	58.5	41.9
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	5.3	1.0	2.2	1.5	14.4
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. It is not surprising that the Japanese response to TQ1, with a total mean of 3.66 is lower than the U.S.'s with a total mean of 4.13. With the prevailing value of hierarchial relationships, students and teachers are not recognized as "equals" in Japanese society. However, note that combined percentage of 53.3% of the Japanese feel that it is "good" to "very good behavior." Again, they indicate that they would like this behavior but not that the teacher actually treats them in this way. The response to TQ20 (see Table XXXIX) is also favorable to the Japanese, but the variance of responses is wider than in the U.S.. Note that 69.4% of the total Japanese group and 90.2% of the total U.S. group indicate that this is "good" or "very good" behavior. The results of TQ13 indicate that the U.S. and Japanese feel similarly concerning the issue of treating someone with special needs differently. Fewer responses in the Japanese study, however, show that this is "poor" behavior-- 10.7% verses 16.2% in the U.S..

C. Teacher Attributes

Items TQ7 and TQ24 will be discussed in the following category.

TQ7: If shown to be mistaken, is willing to admit it.

TABLE XL

FREQUENCY FOR TQ7: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR	*	0.9	1.7	1.9	1.6	0.0	1.9
2.POOR	*	0.9	3.9	1.0	3.1	0.8	6.1
3.FAIR	*	7.7	16.6	8.7	17.0	6.9	15.3
4.GOOD	*	32.1	22.2	31.7	22.9	32.3	20.3

(continued on the next page)

5.VERY GOOD	*	57.3	50.6	56.7	53.4	57.7	42.5
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	5.1	0.0	2.0	2.3	13.9
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TQ24: Adds humor to his/her lectures

TABLE XLI

FREQUENCY FOR TQ24: U.S. AND JAPAN CONTRASTED

ORDINAL SCALE		TOTAL GRP POPULATION (%)		HIGHSCHOOL POPULATION (%)		UNI/COLLEGE POPULATION (%)	
		US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN	US	JAPAN
1.VERY POOR	*	2.1	1.8	3.8	2.0	0.8	1.4
2.POOR	*	3.0	2.9	3.8	2.8	2.3	3.1
3.FAIR	*	8.1	16.1	5.8	16.8	10.0	13.9
4.GOOD	*	36.8	30.7	34.6	32.3	38.5	26.1
5.VERY GOOD	*	48.7	43.4	51.0	44.1	46.9	41.4
NO RESPONSE	*	1.3	5.1	1.0	2.0	1.5	14.2
TOTAL %		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Discussion. Both TQ7 and TQ24 (see Tables XL and XLI) yielded very positive responses in both the Japanese and U.S. studies. The difference between the two studies lies in the fact that it is very likely and often expected of a teacher in the U.S. to possess these attributes. In Japan, these attributes may be admired but they are not expected behaviors of a teacher.

Observation Checklists

As in Chapter IV, the report of the observation checklists is not statistically sound but rather an informal report of classroom behavior. Barna observed 18 classrooms in Japan. They were all English language classes. The results of her observations are very different from those in the U.S. study. She reports that there was no student participation

during each class period except when responding in a drill fashion. For "Teacher-Student Communication," the teacher presented material at all times and students did not present any material. The only type of questions recorded in her observations were those asked by the teacher for a correct response. Students faced the teacher 100% of the time. Barna reports that the classroom climate in Japan was more tense, formal and controlled than the U.S. classes observed. On three scales from 7 to 1: 7 = tense, formal, and controlled; and 1 = relaxed, informal, and uncontrolled, the means were 5.21, 5.93, and 6.07 respectively. These means compared to the earlier reported means of 3.40, 2.60, and 4.80 from the U.S. study. Overall, one can see the large difference between the results of the two checklists. Where the U.S. students participated, and asked questions, the Japanese students did not. The U.S. classes also showed more variety of activities, i.e. students giving reports, working in groups, etc. The U.S. classes were more relaxed, informal and uncontrolled than the Japanese. Although informal, these observations support the literature review and the data gathered from the questionnaires.

Conclusion

One way to better appreciate our behaviors as culturally learned and the result of underlying values is to make a comparison or contrast with another culture. As quoted by Condon (1976) earlier, "It is only when we go outside our familiar territory that we realize not everybody behaves in the same way" (p.4). The contrast of classroom behaviors between the U.S. and Japan has provided the opportunity for the U.S. reader to "go outside his/her familiar territory" and see his/her

seemingly natural behaviors contrasted with another culture's. In essence, it has allowed one to be more cognizant of his/her own cultural conditioning and its influence on his/her behavior.

The results of the contrast between the two studies has shown that there are several differences between the Japanese and U.S classroom. The HS in Japan is stricter and more ritualized than the UNI in Japan; and in the U.S., the UNI is more formal and less interactive than the U.S. HS. The major differences between the U.S. and Japan classroom role behaviors reflect the basic value differences between the two societies. The Japanese value of groupism is reflected in the students' reticence to volunteer questions and participate in the classroom. The value of individualism in the U.S. encourages students to freely partake in classroom discussions and give their opinion. In Japan, each person knows his place in society. It is a society of hierarchial relationships. This compares to the U.S. value of equality where students are expected to and appreciate being treated as an individual and an equal. In the U.S., a student may feel he/she can challenge the teacher. This would not happen in Japan. A student would not challenge the authority of the teacher since it would break the harmonious balance between the two. Students in Japan, especially in the high school, behave in a way that is expected from them in their society. They wear uniforms to school (a "group" distinction and a discouragement of individualism), and greet the teacher ritualistically, showing respect to authority. They never speak out and give their personal opinion. Concenus of the group is far more important than the individual's opinion. The U.S. students also behave in accordance to their society's expectations.

They dress how they feel comfortable, greet a teacher if they want to, and participate in the classroom as they are encouraged by their teacher. Although both studies show that students appreciate a teacher who is willing to talk with them and treat them as equals, this behavior actually occurs and is expected in the U.S. and not in Japan.

It has been the purpose of this contrastive analysis not only to analyze the data provided by the two studies, but also to discuss the findings in relation to known facts about the two cultures. It appears evident that our classroom role behaviors and expectations are culturally determined. If these basic differences can be detected between the U.S. and Japan, then it can be assumed that differences occur between other cultures as well.

TABLE XLII

COMPARISON OF RESULTS FROM U.S. AND JAPAN STUDIES
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL,
UNIVERSTIY/COLLEGE, AND TOTAL POPULATION

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE		HS MEAN	UNI/COL MEAN	TOTGRP MEAN	HS SD	UNI/COL SD	TOTGRP SD
US	SQ1	3.55	3.13	3.32	.84	.91	.90
JAPAN	SQ1	2.43	1.94	2.29	1.06	0.91	1.05
US	SQ4	3.97	4.32	4.16	.94	.78	.87
JAPAN	SQ4	3.65	3.94	3.72	1.09	1.13	1.11
US	SQ7	3.89	3.61	3.73	.84	.95	.91
JAPAN	SQ7	2.15	1.93	2.09	1.07	0.92	1.04
US	SQ8	3.78	3.62	3.69	.80	.94	.88
JAPAN	SQ8	3.71	3.91	3.77	.95	1.00	.97
US	SQ10	3.81	3.31	3.53	.90	1.09	1.04
JAPAN	SQ10	4.42	2.93	4.03	.97	1.20	1.22
US	SQ12	4.65	4.24	4.48	.62	1.16	.84
JAPAN	SQ12	4.23	3.05	3.94	1.01	1.68	1.31
US	SQ15	1.93	1.59	1.74	.93	.81	.88
JAPAN	SQ15	1.85	1.78	1.83	1.12	1.08	1.11
US	SQ18	2.62	2.92	2.78	1.01	1.20	1.12
JAPAN	SQ18	3.23	2.79	3.12	1.12	1.27	1.18
US	SQ19	3.01	3.25	3.16	.94	.93	.92
JAPAN	SQ19	3.13	2.85	3.06	.95	1.10	1.00
US	TQ1	4.22	4.05	4.13	.80	.87	.84
JAPAN	TQ1	3.60	3.79	3.65	1.06	1.07	1.06
US	TQ2	3.26	3.11	3.20	1.07	1.10	1.05
JAPAN	TQ2	3.34	3.29	3.32	.98	1.04	.99

KEY: HS = High School students
UNI/COL = University and College students
TOTGRP = Total group
SD = Standard Deviation

(continued on the next page)

TABLE XLII (continued)

ITEM # ON QUESTIONNAIRE		HS MEAN	UNI/COL MEAN	TOTGRP MEAN	HS SD	UNI/COL SD	TOTGRP SD
US	TQ7	4.40	4.40	4.46	.84	.95	.75
JAPAN	TQ7	4.26	4.11	4.22	.96	1.07	.99
US	TQ13	3.33	3.19	3.34	1.14	1.24	1.09
JAPAN	TQ13	3.31	3.39	3.33	1.04	1.02	1.03
US	TQ20	4.49	4.40	4.50	.80	.91	.70
JAPAN	TQ20	4.03	4.15	4.06	1.03	1.03	1.03
US	TQ24	4.22	4.24	4.29	1.09	.95	.90
JAPAN	TQ24	4.16	4.20	4.17	.95	.95	.95
US	TQ27	2.80	2.61	2.73	1.23	1.24	1021
JAPAN	TQ27	3.34	3.18	3.30	1.11	1.03	1.02

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This study, through a literature review, questionnaire and informal observations, created a profile of the U.S. classroom that subsequently was contrasted to another culture--Japan-- and showed that role behaviors in the classroom are different between the cultures. The differences found between the U.S. and Japanese classroom reflected the basic value differences between the two cultures. This chapter will describe the limitations of the study and review the differences found between the U.S. and Japan in terms of possible problems that could occur in the classroom if the teacher was not cognizant of cultural differences or his/her own cultural assumptions. This will satisfy the third purpose of the study (see page 9). It will also discuss the necessity of cultural self-awareness training needed for educators with culturally mixed classes; as well as suggest practical uses one could gain from the study. The latter discussion will be followed by suggestions for future research and some concluding remarks.

Limitations

As is true with most research studies, certain limitations are apparent. Notice should be taken of the design of the questionnaire, the population studied, the reliability test results. In contrasting the U.S. to Japan, there are possible limitations due to the translation process and the nature of cross-cultural research.

Subjects were asked to react to hypothetical behaviors that were out of context. This in itself poses as a limitation. Speaking on the importance of context, Hall (1977) says that "without context, the code is incomplete since it encompasses only part of the message" (p.86). He further states that "...it is impossible to separate the individual from the environment in which he functions" (p.100). The out-of-context nature of the questionnaire items encouraged the participants to project how they felt about a certain teacher behavior even if they had never experienced these particular behaviors. When asked to estimate how often they engaged in a particular behavior, no specific context, time, or place was supplied.

The method of translation could possibly cause certain limitations in both the Japanese and this study. The problem of equivalency is an important issue in translation. One must depend on the translator to remain true to the original concept while selecting vocabualry and syntax of the second language that is similar yet appropriate. Back translation is a process in which a piece of writing that has been translated into another language and then back translated by another translator or set of translators to check the adequacy of the translation. "Presumably, by successive translations and back translations a better and better approximation to the original can be obtained..." (Sechrest, Fay, and Zaidi, 1982, p.231). A difficulty in back translation can occur when a satisfactory word or equivalent concept is lacking (p.233). Since the questionnaire was back translated from the Japanese version of the Barna original, some wording on the questionnnaire may have appeared awkward to some and caused confusion. A conscious effort

was made to call attention to seemingly awkward items. The back translation was used to help ensure that the two versions (in Japanese and English) of the questionnaire were as similar as possible.

In Japan, Barna (1986) faced many of the problems of translation and back translation. In reference to the discrepencies found by the P.S.U. translators between the final form of the Japanese questionnaire and the English translation, Barna reports in a personal interview possible reasons why the discrepencies could have occured. First, she felt that some of the concepts included in the statements might have been too unfamilar to have been well understood in Japan. She purposely included items that she knew were common in the U.S. but that she had not observed in Japan in order to make a contrastive analysis. When interviewed, she stated the following:

> The translators would question me about an item, talk with each other (in Japanese so that I could not tell how they had processed my explanation), often make a sharp intake of breath (a nonverbal indication of confusion), and finally write the translation. Often they would go back and make changes, never seeming to be satisfied. It was as if they could not believe I would want them to write an item of behavior that they knew was unthinkable for a Japanese and were trying to phrase it in a way that would make it plausible. I would have to keep reminding them that these questionnaires would also be used in the U.S. and that such behaviors or ways of thinking were more common there.

A second problem involved negatives and positives. Japanese seldom say "no" (Imae, 1970). They are also careful to phrase questions in such a way that a respondent would not be forced with the problem of finding a "round-about" way of indicating negation. Barna explains:

> I knew it was troublesome for the translators to have to take my direct statements and write them in an indirect form that would be more acceptable to Japanese readers. It was even more frustrating for me as a researcher because I was anxious to get them to faithfully reproduce my clear, nonambiguous statements

> —knowing all the while this was not the preferred Japanese form. How could I find out if a student "never" behaved in a certain way if he/she couldn't, or wouldn't, clearly say so? This is one illustration of the difficulty of cross-cultural research.

Barna continued to report that even her own communication with the various translators was a challenge. They would seemingly reply in a positive way to whatever was asked, leading her to believe everything was proceeding smoothly. Errors and problems would surface later, only after much quiet time together with her or at some unexpected moment during conversations with other Japan educators.

By the time Prof. Barna finished pilot tests on the island of Kyushu, the questionnaire had been voluntarily revised by a group of ten Japanese English language teachers, headed by Prof. Fukuda, Head of the English Language Dept. at Kumomoto University. It was this final version that was used in her Japanese study and given to the four P.S.U. students for back translation for this present study.

The representative nature of the sample is a problem faced by all researchers including this one. All subjects were gathered from schools in the S.W. Portland area. There is the possiblity that results would have been different if subjects through out the Portland area or other cities had been chosen.

The results of the reliability test presents certain limitations to this specific study. Only 16 items out of the 51 on the questionnaire were reliable in both the U.S. and Japanese study which limited the amount of possible contrastive analysis.

In contrasting the results of this study to those in the Japanese study, certain other limitations need to be considered. First, there

are general differences between the two studies that should be noted. Questionnaires in the Japanese study were gathered from 1382 students from Tokyo and from cities in the northern and southern regions of Japan. This is compared to the 234 students from the Portland area in the U.S. study. Barna was unable to administer the questionnaire herself due to regulations in Japan, while this researcher did administer the majority of the questionnaires for this study. Finally, the use of a questionnaire in Japan is not as commonplace as it in the U.S. as was previously mentioned by Barna (1986). It is possible that the interpretation of the items on the questionnaire was different than in the U.S. and the experience itself was unusual enough to have caused difficulty for the Japanese subjects.

This type of research depends on the truthfulness of the participants and assumes that information provided is sincere and honest. Subjects were given the option to participate in the study and each one signed a consent form. The material on the questionnaire was not considered threatening and subjects were ensured that their questionnaires would remain anonymous. At each administration, the purpose of the study was given and the need for honest opinions was asked for. It can only be hoped that the subjects did report accurately and truthfully.

Even though certain precautions were taken to reduce the limitations, as in any study of this kind, some were unavoidable. It is awknowledged that these and possible other limitations exist.

Practical Implications

As Deborah Johnson, the inexperienced ESL teacher, demonstrated at the beginning of this study, not having an awareness of her own cultural

assumptions nor knowledge of Japanese culture was devastating to her teaching career. She had judged the behaviors of her students according to her own cultural expectations without realizing it. She was frustrated with the formality and seriousness of the students. She could not understand why they always conferred on an answer and never would volunteer information individually. She did not see that the U.S. values of individuality, equality, and informality were causing her to judge those who were guided by the values of groupism, hierachial relationships and formality. Instead, she thought something was wrong.

Ms. Johnson's plight is a typical one that can happen to anyone without cultural self-awareness training. The results of this study show there are differences between the role behaviors in the U.S. and Japan. Since there are differences, teachers must be prepared to handle them as they occur in a culturally mixed classroom. One way to be prepared is to acquire the awareness of one's own culture, through which one can learn to expect differences when in an intercultural situation. English (1980) comments on the necessity for cultural self-awareness training for teachers. She has labeled this term "intercultural awareness:"

> The need for teacher training in intercultural awareness becomes evident when we consider that ESL teachers are as much 'foreigners' in the mixed cultural classroom as their students and that it is equally difficult for teacher to view classroom occurrences objectively. In effect, they fall victim to the same factors of cultural expectations, perceptions, attributions, and the ethnocentric view which may be at the source of a problem (p.163).

There are two schools of thought for training individuals to communicate effectively interculturally. They are the culture-specific, which focuses on learning about other cultures, and the culture-general

training, which focuses on cultural self-awareness. Samovar, Porter, and Jain, (1981) and Grove (1982), agree that culture-general training helps prepare one to communicate effectively with any culture rather than a specific one. They advocate this type of training over culture-specific training which focuses on aspects of a given culture. Although culture-specific training is more commonly used (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, p.61), it has certain draw backs that should be noted. For example, if a teacher learns just facts about Japanese student behavior but still remains ignorant to his/her own cultural values and assumptions, and does not know why the Japanese students act the way they do, he/she might expect certain behaviors from the students but still hold on to his/her ethnocentric ideas. Grove (1982) contends that "training that attempts to simulate an unfamiliar culture (culture-specific training) is likely to oversimplify matters to a considerable degree, and to provide trainees with a false sense of confidence" (p.8). By having a sense of cultural self-awareness, through culture-general training, one "should be able to suspend judgement when confronted in an intercultural encounter by behavior that appears odd" (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, 1981, p.62). Culture-general training as opposed to culture-specific, is especially necessary for the ESL teacher who often has a wide variety of cultures represented in one class. Where it is nearly impossible to know everything about every culture, it is possible to know about ourselves and to know why we expect the things we do and why we behave the way we do.

Once we have acquired the ability to recognize our own cultural assumptions, expectations and values, any added information about an-

other culture should prove rather helpful. This study has contrasted two cultures which are vitually different from each other in order to provide the U.S. reader the opportunity to see his/her own culture as being different from another. In addition, the information on Japanese culture may prove useful for anyone who is planning to travel or teach in Japan or teach the Japanese here. Realizing that the Japanese student is not going to respond like the U.S. teacher expects can aid the teacher in planning lessons, and adapting his/her style of teaching to fit the needs of the students. With success, this researcher has found that talking to students about classroom behavior and expectations can improve communication in the classroom.

Suggestions for Future Research

Only High schools and University differences were examined in this study. It would be interesting to see any of the other demographics explored further. It would also be interesting to expand the U.S. population and include more sub-cultures or do a contrastive study in the U.S. to see how sub-cultures differ from the mainstream that was targeted in this study. Since so many of the questions proved unreliable in the U.S. study, it would be benefical to rework this study by trying different translations until a higher number of items were reliable. The use of a seven-point scale would possibly improve the reliability but this would not match the Barna study. It is further suggested that more classroom centered research is needed especially for the culturally mixed classroom where so many cultural differences are in constant interaction.

Concluding Remarks

This research project has studied the role behaviors of teachers and students in a cross-cultural context. Discovering certain differences between the U.S and Japan has shown the importance of gaining cultural self-awareness for the educator in the culturally mixed class. The project has also experienced the difficulty of cross-cultural research which at times was as interesting as the findings from the questionnaires. It is sincerely hoped that one has gained insight and an heightened awareness from the information provided. It is also hoped that some educators will find this useful and applicable to their own classroom situations and others will have been encouraged to discover more about the impact cultural differences may have on the classroom environment.

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, Sam and John L. Garrett Jr. To Be A Teacher: An Introduction to Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Allwright, Dick. "On Language Teaching and Learning: A Brief Overview." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 17, no. 2, June 1983.

Andersen, Janis. "Educational Assumptions Highlighted from a Cross-cultural Comparison." in Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Eds. Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter. 4th ed., Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co. 1984, pp. 160-164.

_____, and Peter Andersen. "Nonverbal Immediacy in Instruction." in Communication in the Classroom. Ed. Larry L. Barker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentis Hall, 1982.

Barker, Larry, L. Ed. Communication in the Classroom. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentis Hall, 1982.

Barna, LaRay M. personal interview, April 20, 1986, Portland, OR.

_____. "Study of Normative Student and Teacher Role Behaviors in Japan." Unpublished manuscript. 1986.

_____. "Stumbling Blocks in Intercultural Communication." in Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Eds. Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter. 3rd ed, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1982, pp. 322-330.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1967.

Brophy, Jere E., and Carolyn M. Evertson. Student Characteristics and Teaching. New York: Longman Inc., 1981.

Cathcart, Dolores and Robert Cathcart. "Japanese Social Experience and Concept of Groups." Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Eds. Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter. 3rd ed, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing co., 1982, pp. 120-127.

Clark, Cecil D., Ralph B. Smith, Timothy I. Newby, and Verna A. Cook. "Perceived Origins of Teaching Behavior." in Journal of Teacher Education. Nov-Dec. 1985, pp. 49-53.

Clark, Leonard H., and Irving Starr. Secondary School Teaching Methods. 3rd ed, Macmillon Publishing Co., 1976.

Condon, John C., and Fathi Yousef. An Introduction to Intercultural Communication. Indiananpolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1977.

Cooper, Pamela J. Speech Communication for the Classroom Teacher. Gorsuch Scarisfrick Publishing Co., 1981.

Cuban, Larry. "How Did Teachers Teach, 1890-1980." in Theory into Practice. Vol. 22, no. 3, 1982, pp. 159-165.

Cuculllu, Lois B. "Cultural Accomodation in a Foreign University Classroom." TESOL Newsletter. Vol. 16, no. 5, October 1982.

Devito, Joseph A. Communicology. New York: Harper and Row, Publishing Co., 1982.

Doyle, Walter. "Classroom Effects." in Theory into Practice. Vol. 18, no. 3, June, 1979, pp. 138-143.

English, Susan Lewis. "Critical Incidents Workshop for ESL Teacher Intercultural Awareness Training." in On TESOL '80. 1980.

Fain, Stephen M., and Robert Shostak. Teaching in America. Glenview Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1979.

Flanders, Ned A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc. 1970.

Friedrich, Gustav W., Kathleen M. Galvin, and Cassandra L. Book. Growing Together...Classroom Communication. Columbus, Ohio: Bell and Howell Co., 1976.

Friedrich, Gustav W. "Classroom Interaction." in Communication in the Classroom. Ed. Larry L. Barker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentis-Hall Publishing Co., 1982, pp. 55-74.

Gaies, Stephen. "Classroom Centered Research, State of the Art." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 17, no. 2, June, 1983.

Galloway, C. "Nonverbal: The Language of Sensitivity." Theory into Practice. Vol. 10, 1971, pp. 227-230.

Getzels, J.W. "Images of the Classroom and Visions of the Learner." Learning Environments. Eds. Thomas G. David, and Benjamin Dwright. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Goble, Norman M. The Changing Role of the Teacher: International Perspectives. UNESCO, 1977.

Gran, John M. How to Understand and Teach Teen-agers. _____, 1958.

Greenbaum, Paul E., and Susan D. Greenbaum. "Cultural Differences in Nonverbal Regulations and Classroom Interaction Socialinguistics Interference in American Indian Education." Peabody Journal of Education. Vol. 61, no. 1, Fall 1983, pp. 16-30.

Grove, Cornelius Lee. "Improving Intercultural Learning Through the Orientation of Sojourners." AFS Occasional Papers in Intercultural Learning. Publication of AFS International/Intercultural programs, June 1982.

Hall, Edward T. Beyond Culture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1977.

_____. The Silent Language. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1959.

Halloran, Richard. JAPAN: Images and Realities. Tokyo, Japan, Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1970.

Harris, Philip R., and Robert T. Moran. "Understanding Cultural Differences." in Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Eds. Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter. 3rd ed, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing co., 1982, pp. 62-72.

Hawley, Willis D., and Susan J.Rosenholtz, with Henry Goodstein, and Ted Hasselbring. "Effective Teaching." Peabody Journal of Education. Vol. 61, no. 4, Summer, 1984.

Heck, Shirley, T., and Ray C. Williams. The Complex Roles of the Teacher: An Ecological Perspective. Teachers College, Columbia University. New York: Teachers College Press, 1984.

Hills, Philip. Teaching and Learning as a Communication Process. Halsted Press, a division of John Wiliy and Sons, Inc., 1979.

Imae, Masaaki. Sixteen Ways to Avoid Saying No. Tokyo, Japan: Nihon Keizah Shim Bun Inc., 1981.

Irving, Kathy. "Cross-Cultural Awareness and the ESL Classroom." Theory into Practice. Vol. 23, no. 2, 1984.

Jenkins, Mercelie. Removing Bias: Guidelines for Student - Faculty Communication. Speech Communication Assoc., 1983.

Levine, Deena R., and Mara B. Adelman. Beyond Language: Intercultural Communication for English as a Second Language. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentis Hall, Inc., 1982.

Lindeman, Richard H. and Peter F. Merenda. Educational Measurement. 2nd ed., Scott, Foresman and Co., 1979.

Love, A.M., and J.A. Roderick. "Teacher, Nonverbal Communication: The Developement and Field Testing of a Awareness Unit." Theory into Practice. Vol. 10, no. 4, October 1971, pp. 295-299.

Lowman, Joseph. Mastering the Techniques of Teaching, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Mishra, Shilala P. "Correlates of Effective Teaching as Measured by Student Ratings." Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 49, no. 1, 1980, pp. 59-62.

Nadal, Kathryne J. "A Cross-cultural Study of Role Behaviors Pertaining to the Roles of Student and Professor". Master's Thesis for the Department of Speech Communication at Portland State University, 1980.

Nakane, Chie. Japanese Society. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1970.

Nuthall, Graham, and Ivan Snook. "Contempory Models of Teaching." in Ed. Robert M.W. Travers, Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 47-72.

Ochsner, Robert. "A Review of ESL Comprehensive Examinations in M.A. Programs." TESOL Newsletter. Vol. 14, no. 5, Oct. 1980, pp. 9-11.

Ornstein, Allen, C. "Research on Teaching: Issues and Trends." Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. 36, no. 6, Nov-Dec. 1985.

Pellicer, Leonard O. "Effective Teaching: Science or Magic?." The Clearing House. Vol. 58, no. 2, Oct. 1984, pp. 53-56.

Porter, Richard E., and Larry A. Samovar. "Approaching Intercultural Communication." in Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Eds. Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter. 3rd ed, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing co., 1982, pp. 26-42.

Prosser, Michael H. The Cultural Dialogue: An Introduction to Intercultural Communication. Boston: Houghton Mufflin co., 1978.

Pusch, Margarat ed. Multicultural Education: A Cross-cultural Training Approach. Intercultural Press, Inc., 1981.

Rich, Andrea L. Interracial Communication. New York: Harper and Row Publishing Co., 1974.

Ruesch, Jurgen. "Communication and Human Relations: An Interdisciplinary Approach." Interpersonal Communication: Basic Text and Readings. Bobby R. Patton and Kim Griffin, Eds., New York: Harper and Row, 1974, pp. 56-67.

Samovar, Larry A., Richard E. Porter, and Nemi C. Jain. Understanding Intercultural Communication. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1981.

Sato, Charlene J. "Ethnic Styles in Classroom Discourse." On TESOL '81. 1981.

Sechrest, Lee, Todd L. Fay, and S.M. Zaidi. "Problems of Translation in Cross-cultural Communication." in Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Eds. Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter. 3rd ed, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing co., 1982, pp. 223-232.

Shavelson, Richard J., and Paula Stern. "Research on Teachers Pedagogical Thoughts, Inogements, Decisions and Behaviors." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 5, no. 4, Winter 1981, pp. 455-498.

Sirotnik, _____. "What You See is What You Get." Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 55, no. 1, 1983.

Smith, Larry S. "TESOL and Training Non-native English Speakers: Are M.A. Teacher Education Programs Getting the Job Done?" Part 2. On TESOL '80. 1980.

Stewart, Edward C. American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-cultural Perspective. Pittsburgh, Penn.: Regional Council for International Education. November 1972.

Sukwiwat, Mayuri. "TESOL and Training Non-native English Speakers: Are M.A. Teacher Education Programs Getting the Job Done?" Part 1. On TESOL '80. 1980.

Sullivan, Patrice. "Teaching Social Rules of Behavior." TESL Reporter, Brigham Young University - Hawaii Campus. Vol. 14, no. 4, summer 1981.

Sussman, _____. The Teacher and Educational Change: A New Role. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Paris, 1974.

Todd-Mencillas, William R. "Classroom Environment and Nonverbal Behavior." in Communication in the Classroom. Ed. Larry L. Barker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentis-Hall, 1982.

Whittaker, Leon. "Student Expectations of Teachers Love and Authority." The Clearing House for the Contempory Educator in Middle and Secondary Schools. Vol. 59 no. 2, October 1985.

Williams, Fredrick. Reasoning with Statistics. 2nd Ed. 1968, rpt. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979.

Williams, Robert O. "What Teaching Methods When?" Theory into Practice. Vol. 19, no.2, Spring 1980.

Woolfolk, Anita E., and Charles M. Galloway. "Non-verbal Communication and the Study of Teaching." Theory into Practice, Vol. 24, no.1, Winter 1985.

Ziegler, V., G. Boardman, and D. Thomas. "Humor, Leadership, and School Climate. Clearing House. Vol. 58, 1985, p. 346.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE, OBSERVATION CHECKLIST,

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE APPROVAL,

CONSENT FORM, COVER LETTER SENT TO SCHOOLS,

QUESTIONNAIRE DIRECTIONS

STUDENT - ROLE BEHAVIOR

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME

(students and teachers)

How often do you (or your students) engage in the following possible classroom behaviors? Please select the number which most closely reflects your estimate.

5= always 4= often 3= sometimes 2=rarely 1= never

For example: 1) _4_ Do you volunteer questions without hesitation?

1) ___ Do you volunteer questions without hesitation?

2) ___ Do you use critical analysis when listening?

3) ___ Do you correct or question a teacher's mistake?

4) ___ Do you make home work neat and legible?

5) ___ Do you memorize details?

6) ___ Do you take notes in class for future study?

7) ___ Do you participate in class discussion, share ideas and express your opinion?

8) ___ Do you think and speak quickly when called on by the teacher?

9) ___ Do you admit that you haven't mastered the material?

10) ___ Do you show respect to the teacher in some way when entering or leaving the class? (For example: saying hello or good-bye to the teacher)

11) ___ Do you raise your hand for permission to speak?

12) ___ Do you maintain proper personal grooming and the dress code?

13) ___ Do you do whatever the teacher directs?

14) ___ Do you go to your teacher to find out what happened in class when you have been absent?

15) ___ Do you ever go to the teacher's office without an obvious reason?

16) ___ Do you drink and/or eat in class?

17) ___ Do you accept the authority of the teacher?

18) ___ Do you want to know the scores and grades of other students in the class?

19) ___ Do you have good sitting posture?

20) ___ Do you not disturb the class with noise or movement?

21) ___ Do you show attention to the teacher with eye contact?

22) ___ Do you ever go to the teacher voluntarily to make inquiries about study methods?

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSES: (Students only)

Is the School where you attend: Public? or Private?

Secondary? or College/University?

Year in school: FR SO JR SR

Sex: M F

Have you ever studied abroad? Y N If yes, Where and for how long?_____

TEACHER - ROLE BEHAVIOR

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME

(students and teachers)

Please select the number which most closely reflects your attitude in general about the following possible behaviors of teachers in the classroom.

5= very good behavior 4= good 3= fair 2= poor 1= very poor behavior

For example: 1) _3_ Treats students as if they were an equal...

1) ___ Treats students as if they were an equal: acts as a friend as well as a teacher

2) ___ Will permit students to take over and direct the class at times

3) ___ Encourages students to speak up in class

4) ___ Asks for students' opinions

5) ___ Lectures by reading from prepared notes

6) ___ Answers any question that is asked in class about the subject matter

7) ___ If shown to be mistaken, is willing to admit it

8) ___ Prefers to use a discussion rather than a straight lecture format most of the time

9) ___ Expresses personal opinion about subject matter

10) ___ Does stick to the textbook during lectures

11) ___ Gives the necessary information during class and doesn't expect students to go to the library to learn it

12) ___ Assigns the reading of materials for extra information that is not included in the texts

13) ___ Gives students with special problems a lot of extra attention (i.e. students with phsyical or mental disabilities)

14) ___ Uses the same set of standards for grading purposes for everyone even though some students may have special difficulties; such as: an illness, etc.

15) ___ Calls on students only when they volunteer

16) ___ Relies primarily on tests for judging student's abilities

17) ___ Relies primarily on class performance for judging student's abilities

18) ___ Is demanding: requires students to meet high standards and classroom obligations

19) ___ Encourages group activities and group assignments

20) ___ Shows willingness to talk to students at any time -- before or after class, in the office, or outside school

21) ___ For comprehension check, prefers that students write a report about classroom material rather than have them answer questions orally in class

22) ___ Will relate his/her personal life and feelings to the subject matter discussed in class

23) ___ Prefers that students remain quiet in class

24) ___ Adds humor to his/her lectures

25) ___ Encourages a relaxed class atmosphere

26) ___ Asks questions of students in order according to a seating chart

27) ___ Will wait as long as one or two minutes for a student to think of an answer to a question

28) ___ Is energetic

29) ___ Is neat and well groomed in his/her appearance

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSES: (Teachers only)

Is the school where you teach: Public? or Private?

Secondary? or College/University?

Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 over 50

Sex: M F

Have you ever studied or taught abroad? N Y If yes, Where and for how long? _____

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST
(reduced sample)

Observation Check List of Classroom Communication Style — Prof. LaRay Barna, PSU

School: public or private _____ Grade level _____ Subject being taught _____
Has teacher lived outside of the country for more than 6 months? _____

I. Amount of student participation

Length of period _____ Student talk-time (in seconds) _____ % of period _____
(use stop watch)

II. Teacher-student communication

	1st 5 min	2nd 5 min	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th
TP (teacher presents information)										
TP+SRO (teacher presents and student responds to the concepts orally)										
TP+SRD (teacher presents and student(s) respond by repetition or drill										
TP+SRW (teacher presents and students respond in written form, i.e., a test										
SP (student presents information)										
SP+SR (student presents and other students correct or respond in drill fashion)										
SP+TR (student presents information and teacher approves or corrects)										

(Check which of the categories predominated during each 5 minutes of the class. If two were about equal put ½ in the two boxes--or other fractions.)

III. Type of Questioning

Tally each time a student asks the teacher for information regarding instructions or proper procedures to take; i.e., "When will this homework be due?" _____

Tally each time a student requests information about of makes a comment about the material being presented _____

Tally each time the teacher asks questions of the students for which there is a correct answer. _____

Tally each time the teacher asks questions of the students which requires original thinking or critical analysis. _____

IV. Student Work Setting

All students facing teacher	_____	% of period
Arranged in small work groups	_____	% of period
Working in pairs	_____	% of period
Individually working, here and there (not in rows facing teacher)	_____	% of period

(total should be 100%)

V. Student Behavior

	1st 5 min	2nd 5 min	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th
Att= How many students look attentive or interested?										
Par= How many students are actively participating (speaking, writing)										
OT= How many students are off-task (sleeping, conversing, etc.)										

(Give a rough estimate every 5 minutes=Most, Few, ½, etc.)

VI. Classroom Climate

What was the general feeling of the classroom? tense or relaxed (scale 1.....to.....) _____
formal or informal " " " _____
controlled or uncontrolled " " "

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 24, 1985

TO: Kathleen Ulrich, SP

FROM: Robert Holloway, Chair [redacted]

In accordance with your request, the Human Subjects Research Review Committee has reviewed your proposal entitled,"A Comparative Study: Normative Teacher & Student Role Behaviors ... in the US and Japan" for compliance with DHHS policies and regulations on the protection of human subjects.

The committee is satisfied that your provisions for protecting the rights and welfare of all subjects participating in the research are adequate and therefore the project is approved. Any conditions relative to this approval are noted below:

Conditions: None (As per phone call the Chair).

cc: Office of Graduate Studies and Research

CONSENT FORM

(subjects over 18 years of age)
I hereby agree to participate in a research project on student and teacher role behavior in the classroom conducted by Kathleen Ulrich, a graduate student at Portland State University.

(subjects under 18 years of age)
I agree to allow my son/daughter to participate in a research project on student and teacher role behavior in the classroom conducted by Kathleen Ulrich, a graduate student at Portland State University.

I understand that the purpose of this study is to draw a profile of normative classroom behaviors of U.S. teachers and students. The information I provide will be compared to data gathered from a study done in Japan.

I have been assured that all information I give will be kept confidential and that the identity of all subjects will remain anonymous.

I understand that I am free to withdraw from participation in this study at any time.

SUBJECT'S SIGNATURE_____DATE _____

PARENT/GUARDIAN'S SIGNATURE (if applicable)_____

SAMPLE COVER LETTER
(Sent to high schools)

May 8, 1985

Dr. Tom Lindersmith, Principal
Lakeridge High School
1235 S.W. Overlook Dr.
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Dear Dr. Tom Lindersmith:

I am a graduate student at Portland State University working on my thesis to complete the requirements for a Masters degree in Speech Communication. My main field of interest is in Intercultural communication.

The purpose of this thesis project is to (1) discover the differences between normative classroom behaviors of teachers and students in the U.S. and Japan; and (2) to examine the relationship of these differences (with reference to intercultural communication theory) to how they could possibly affect the teaching and learning process in a class where the teacher and students have differing cultural backgrounds.

In 1983, LaRay Barna, associate professor at P.S.U., conducted a study in Japan concerning classroom role behaviors and interaction patterns of students and teachers. I will be using the same questionnaire used in the Barna study to draw a profile of normative U.S. classroom role behaviors and interaction patterns. I will then compare and contrast the findings of both studies and analyze the differences found.

I am seeking clearance to observe Joan Sullivan's class and to administer the enclosed questionnaires. I have spoken to Joan and she has agreed to partake in the study.

In accordance with Portland State University, each subject will sign a consent form before filling out the enclosed questionnaires. Subjects under the age of 18 must have a parent or guardian sign the consent form as well. I will mail these forms to Joan Sullivan in advance in order for her students to have their parents sign them before I administer the questionnaires which will take about 10 to 15 minutes of class time. All data gathered will be confidential. If you are interested in seeing the results of the study, please let me know and I will gladly provide them to you.

I appreciate you taking time to look over the questionnaires and considering my study. I hope to be hearing from you or Joan in the near future.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Ulrich

ORAL DIRECTIONS READ BEFORE
EACH QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION

P L E A S E R E A D before filling out the questionnaires

This questionnaire that you have agreed to fill out is part of my thesis project for my Masters degree at Portland State University. I am studying the role behaviors and interaction patterns of the U.S. classroom. I will then compare my results to the results of a study that was done in Japan to dsicover specific cultural differences in the classroom. Your honest responses are asked for and greatly appreciated.

Before you begin, let me explain the questionnaire more thoroughly.

1) Fill out both questionnaires. Be sure to read all directions.

2) Answer each question on the "Student-Role Behavior" questionnaire according to how often you engage in these behaviors in the classroom (in general). 5=always 4=often 3=sometimes 2=rarely 1=never

3) note SQ. #20 - This is a double negative. "Do you not disturb the class... For example, yes, I do not (5 or 4).

4) On the "Teacher-Role Behavior" questionnaire, answer the questions according to how you feel about each described behavior. NOT whether your teachers do these behaviors or not. Decide whether these behaviors, are good or not in your opinion.

5) Be sure to fill out the information following the "Student-Role Behavior" questionnaire.

6) Be sure not to write your name.

Thank you for your time!!! Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to ask.